Theology
Bund 1

A

LETTER

TO

Dr. *SYNGE*,

IN

ANSWER

TO HIS

LETTER

INTITLED,

Dr. *Synge*'s Defence of Himself, against the unjust Aspersions thrown upon Him in a late Pamphlet, Intitled, A Reply to a Vindication of the Letter Published in a Pamphlet, call'd, **Partiality Detected**, &c.

By *WILLIAM PERCIVALE*, M. A.
Archdeacon of *CASHEL*.

——*Videt* HUNC *omnis* Domus *&* *Vicinia tota*
Introrsum turpem, speciosum Pelle decorâ. Hor.

DUBLIN: Printed by *Edwin Sandys*, for *John Hyde*, Bookseller in *Dames-Street*, 1711.



THE PREFACE.

THE *Letter, Publiſhed in the Pamphlet Intitled* Partiality Detected, *has been ſo much the* Care *and* Concern *of ſome Perſons, that I cannot but think that they had great* Ends *and* Purpoſes *to ſerve by it: For had the Authors ſingle Perſon only been concern'd in the Reputation of it, certainly ſuch an* Abundance of Pains, Art, and Induſtry *would not have been uſed by Others, and by ſome in great Station, to skreen it from Cenſure. How far the Convocation, that was held under the Earl of* Wharton, *was* permitted *to proceed againſt it; and what* Convulſions *it then occaſioned in our* Conſtitution, *I have already ſhewn in my* Reply *to the* Vindication *of it. I ſhall here proceed to ſhew what ſteps the Lower Houſe of Convocation have ſince taken to do themſelves Juſtice.*

At our firſt Meeting, *or rather our* Reſtauration, *under His Grace the Duke of* Ormonde's *preſent Government, we found our ſelves repoſſeſſed of that Freedom of Acting and Debating, that is eſſential to a* Parliamentary Body. *And the firſt Exerciſe of it was, to pay a Debt of* Gratitude *to my Lords the Biſhops of the Upper Houſe, who, in the late Times of* Danger *and* Difficulty, *had ſhewn themſelves to be moſt Faithful and Affectionate Fathers of the Church and Clergy. It was therefore Ordered,* Nemine contradicente, *That* the Thanks of the Houſe ſhould be returned to them, for their Fatherly Care of the Rights of the Convocation, and their Protection of the *Proteſting* Members of the Lower Houſe. *Which Thanks were accordingly delivered to their Lordſhips by the Prolocutor, attended by his Aſſeſſors and the reſt of the Houſe,* July 14. 1711. *in the Words following,*

May it Pleaſe Your Graces and Lordſhips,

THE Lower Houſe of Convocation preſerving a juſt and due Senſe of Your Graces and Lordſhip's Paternal Care of them, and tender Regard for the Rights of Convo-

cation, ſo often and ſeaſonably ſhewn, ſince their *Happy Reſtoration* and *Revival* by Her Moſt Gracious Majeſty: And more particularly, by Your Graces and Lordſhips moſt undaunted, and generous Refuſal to joyn in a *Groundleſs* and *Illegal* Opinion, *That ſeveral of their Members had acted in Derogation to Her Majeſties* Prerogative, *and might be proſecuted by way of Information, or Indictment, for Words inſerted in a* Proteſt *by them Signed, and enter'd in the Books of their Houſe, June* 30th, 1709. And alſo for Your Graces and Lordſhips vigorous Reſolution, to complain to the Lords in Parliament of thoſe Men, who had, in *Compliance* with the then *Powerful Faction*, given under their Hands, the ſaid Aſſertion or Opinion for *Law:* And likewiſe for Your Graces and Lordſhips, at the ſame time, Ordering and Impowering Two very Worthy and Right Reverend Members of Your Moſt Venerable Body, to undertake a Dangerous and Expenſive Voyage and Journey, at a *Moſt Diſcouraging Juncture*, to lay the whole Affair in a true Light before Her Majeſty, whereby the Rights of Convocation, the Perſons and Fortunes of ſeveral of their Reverend and Worthy Members were preſerved, and the Lower-Clergy Vindicated and Supported;

Have commanded me, in their Names, to return Your Graces and Lordſhips their moſt Solemn Thanks, their moſt Humble and Hearty Acknowledgments, for Your Graces and Lordſhips *Great Watchfulneſs*, *Diſintereſted Zeal*, and *Paternal Regard* at all times, for the Rights of Convocation; Particularly for Your Graces and Lordſhips juſt and ſeaſonable Reſolution of *Aug.* 5. 1709. wherein Your Graces and Lordſhips with a Primitive Courage, truly Declare, *That the Convocation of Ireland, hath a Right to be ſummoned, and meet with every Parliament, that is called in this Kingdom; and is truly a* Parliamentary Aſſiſting Body, *Convened by the Queen's Writ, and hath* Rights, Powers *and* Privileges *of it's own, and that the Members thereof ought, and may freely debate, and give their Opinions in all Matters that ſhall properly come before them.* For all which, and many other Inſtances of Your Graces and Lordſhips Juſtice to the Rights of Convocation in general, and of their Houſe in particular, they do by me, moſt Humbly take leave to aſſure Your Graces and Lordſhips, that they will endeavour to demonſtrate to the World, that No *Time*, No *Power*, No *Management* ſhall ever be able to obliterate

obliterate, or leſſen thoſe moſt dutiful and grateful Sentiments, wherewith Your Graces and Lordſhips *Favour*, *Patronage*, and *Protection* have juſtly fill'd their Hearts.

To which their Lordſhips were pleaſed to Return the following Anſwer.

Mr. Prolocutor,

WE have taken Your *Affectionate* and *Dutiful* Addreſs into Conſideration, and will in proper time Return an Anſwer.

And the Biſhop of Oſſory *and* Killaloe, *having been ſent into* England *by the Upper Houſe, to lay the whole Proceedings, relating to theſe Affairs, in a proper Light before Her Majeſty; it was Ordered that a particular Meſſage of Thanks ſhould be preſented to Them for their particular Services; which was accordingly preſented to the Biſhop of* Killaloe *by the Prolocutor, attended by his Aſſeſſors*, July 17, 1711, *in the following Words*,

My Lord,

THO' the Lower Houſe of Convocation have, with the very firſt opportunity, endeavour'd to ſhew Their Graces and Lordſhips of the Upper-Houſe, the juſt and grateful Senſe They do and always will retain, of the very many ſeaſonable and ſignal Favours, They have receiv'd from that *Moſt Venerable Body*, eſpecially in the Difficulties, under which They labour'd in the late Times of *Tryal*; yet They cannot be ſatisfy'd that They have fully perform'd their Duty, till They have waited upon Your Lordſhip, and acknowledg'd what They more particularly owe to Your Lordſhip's ready and chearful Undertaking, at the Deſire of the Upper Houſe, a dangerous and expenſive Voyage and Journey, for the Service of the Convocation, and the Preſervation of ſeveral of their worthy Members, from the *Ruin* threat'ned them by Ill-deſigning Men, for their reſolutely adhering to the *Juſt*, and *Eſſential Rights* of their Houſe.

For this They do by *Me* return Your Lordſhip their moſt humble and hearty Thanks; and deſire Your Lordſhip to be aſſur'd, that the Lower Clergy are very truly Senſible how much They ſtand indebted to Your Lordſhip's juſt and fatherly *Concern* for the *Preſervation* of their *Rights* and *Privileges*, and

Your

The PREFACE.

Your Lordſhips prudent and ſteddy Management of the great Truſt repos'd in Your Lordſhip by their Graces and Lordſhips of the Upper-Houſe: at a *Time* when the whole ſacred Order was threat'ned with *Ruin*, by the *Attempts* of Bare-fac'd Enemies, and the *Complyances* of Falſe Friends.

And may Almighty God long preſerve Your Lordſhip, for the Good of this *Church* happily Eſtabliſh'd among *Us*, the *Service* of Her *Moſt Sacred Majeſty*, and the *true Intereſt of this Kingdom*; which *Your Lordſhip* has ſufficiently ſhewn *You* have always at *Heart*: and for which *their* open, and ſecret Enemies endeavour, but ineffectually, to maligne and oppoſe *You*.

To which the Right Reverend the Lord Biſhop of Killaloe *was pleaſed to make the following Anſwer,*

Gentlemen,

THE Value You put upon the Biſhop of *Oſſory*'s Services and Mine, is a ſufficent Recompence for the *Trouble*, and Expence We have been at. I, for my part, ſhall think no Labour too Great, where I may be able to do Good, either for the *Convocation* in *General*, or for any *Member* of it in *Particular*.

And the Lord-Biſhop of Oſſory *being at that time in* England, *the ſame Meſſage of Thanks was Preſented to him at his Arrival here*, viz. Octob. 9. 1711. *To which his Lordſhip was pleaſed to make the following Anſwer,*

Mr. Prolocutor,

I Aſſure you, that both the Biſhop of *Killaloe* and I are highly ſenſible of the great Honour the *Lower-Houſe* of *Convocation* has done Us; and for my part, I ſhall never think any *Pains* too much, or *Expence* too great, to Support the *Rights* and *Privileges* of the *Convocation*: and ſhall be ready, on all Occaſions, to devote my Spiritual and Temporal Concerns to that End.

Having thus paid our due Acknowledgments to our Fathers, *who had Protected us in our Afflictions; or rather, who had partaken and ſhared them with us; we thought it neceſſary once more to take the* Letter, *that had Occaſioned theſe Diſturbances, into our*

our Consideration; and now (all Restraints from without Doors being removed) those very Resolutions, *which before were not permitted to pass beyond the Examination of a Committee, are confirm'd and ratified in a full House,* Nemine Contradicente. *Particularly,* That the *Letter* is a False and Scandalous *Libel,* tending to Creat Jealousies and Misunderstandings between the Two Houses of Convocation, designed to make this National *Synod* appear an Illegal *Assembly,* to destroy the known Rights and undoubted Privileges of the *Lower-House,* and to misrepresent in a very reflecting manner the Bishops and Clergy of this Kingdom. *And farther,* That if it shall hereafter appear, that any Member of the House has been the Author of this *Libel,* he ought to be proceeded against, with the severest Censures that the House can inflict.

A Committee was then appointed to enquire after the Author of this Libel; *and upon their Report it was* (July 18.) *Resolved* Nemine Contradicente, That there was sufficient Reason to Charge Dr. *Lambert* with being the Author of it. *And the next day the Doctor was Ordered to attend in his Place, to answer the Charge that the House had against him.*

The Doctor all this while lay Quiet in the Country, conscious perhaps to himself, that his Presence might revive the Resentments, which, he had just Reason to think, the House had against him. The Actuary therefore was directed to notifie to him the Order of the House, and that they demanded his Attendance.

The Doctor (after some trifling Excuses that were not regarded) did accordingly make his Appearance; But, before this, her Majesty's most Gracious Letter, recommending Business of great Consequence, had been Communicated to us. And therefore, (tho' He appeared in the House, and had given Provocations sufficient to justifie the Speediest as well as the Severest Animadversion, yet) we thought fit to postpone this Affair to that, which more immediately concern'd the Church and Kingdom.

We did accordingly, with great Diligence and Dispatch, apply ourselves to the Business recommended to us, and well weigh'd and consider'd every Branch of it. But when Business was over, and not till then, we Order'd the Doctor again to attend, which he did accordingly, Nov. 7. *At which time the Reasons, that had induced the House to charge him with being the Author, were read to him; and it was moved that He should answer directly, whether he were the Author of the Letter, or not.*

It

The PREFACE.

It must be own'd, that, tho not one Member appear'd in favour of the Letter, yet several were tender of the Doctor's Person; which occasioned a long Debate, tho' it was very regular, without the least Heat, or unbecoming Expression. And it must be observed (because it shews the Temper of the House, and Want of Temper is what some Persons, who know us not, are pleased to object to us) that, during the Debate, we had Business several times sent down from the Upper-House, *for our Consideration or Concurrence: And the Debate concerning the Doctor, we adjourn'd as often; Nor was there any One Member for resuming it, till we had first dispatched the Business that was laid before us. For, as intent as we were to do the House Justice against the* Letter-Writer, *we were much more intent upon those Things, which the Exigencies of the Church required, and the Goodness of her Majesty expected from us.*

During the Debate, I must do Dr. Lambert *the Justice to say, that he behaved himself with great Humility and Deference to the House; But he thought it was an unreasonable Question for him to answer, whether he were the Author or not; for that, if he should deny it, no One would believe him: And if he should own it, he should be his own Accuser; and thereby render himself liable to the Censures of the House. But in this he seem'd not to know what Spirit we were of; for tho' we had been indefatigable in the pursuit of Justice, tho' no Promises could allure, no Menaces could frighten us from it; yet he soon found, that we were not acted by the Spirit of Revenge: but were readier to receive a Repenting Brother, than punish an Obstinate Offender. He*

Pag. 5. *had been told in the* Reply *to his* Vindication, *that* had the Letter Writer retracted his Error, acknowledged his Wickedness, beg'd Pardon, and promised Repentance; it might have so wrought upon the Goodness and Compassion of the Members as to have forgiven him. *And in this very Debate, the Person, who had appear'd most in this Controversy, and who therefore, he had reason to think, would have been as implacable as any, was so far from shewing any Bitterness against his Person, that he moved the House to accept of his* Submission *and* Repentance, *in Case he should own himself to be the Author. And such was the Temper and Disposition of the House, that as the Doctor had cause to fear the utmost* Rigour, *in case he continued Obstinate: So had he all the Reason imaginable to expect* Pardon *in case he submitted. He therefore ingeniously own'd himself to be the*

Author

Author, declared his hearty Sorrow *for the Offence he had given, and earneſtly beg'd and obtain'd that Pardon, which ought never to be refuſed to a truly Sorrowful and Penitent Offender.*

And now, ſince the Principal *in this Quarrel has thus retreated, I hope it will have ſome Influence upon Dr.* Synge *his* Second. *And that* He *likewiſe ſince he has ſuch an Example before his Eyes, (an Example that ought to be of ſome Weight and Authority with him) will not think it beneath him, to own himſelf to be at leaſt miſtaken in the Cauſe he is imbarked in. I ſhould have been glad, to have had ſuch a reaſonable Pretence, for Suppreſſing the following Papers: which have been Printed ſome time ago; but which I would not Publiſh, during the Sitting of the* Convocation, *leaſt from thence an Occaſion might have been taken to hinder, or retard the Publick Buſineſs; Which every Man ought to prefer to this Controverſy, how Momentous ſoever it be to the* Rights *and* Liberties *of the* Convocation.

And indeed the Zeal and Unanimity, with which Buſineſs of great Variety and Importance has been Diſpatch'd in both Houſes, have been very remarkable. And we cannot be ſufficiently thankful to our moſt Gracious SOVEREIGN, *for having given us this happy Opportunity of promoting the Glory of God, and the Intereſt of Religion: And particularly for having placed us under the Protection of a Wiſe, and Generous* GOVERNOUR, *whoſe Glory and whoſe Delight it is to promote the Good of this Church and Nation: And under whoſe Wing, we have enjoy'd all the Bleſſings of Peace and Unity, and have been able with Pleaſure and Security to look back upon thoſe Waves, in which lately we had almoſt Periſh'd.*

THE CONTENTS.

SEveral Falſhoods, *in point of Fact, proved to be in Dr.* Synge's *Letter.* Page 2. to Page 15.

The Paragraph undertaken to be Defended by Dr. Synge. p. 15.

The Maxim, That every Writing, as well as every Man, is preſumed to be Good and True, till the contrary be made to appear, *confuted out of the* Reply. p. 16.

The Maxim as amended by Dr. Synge, *conſidered.* p. 20.

Dr. Synge's *Argument to prove, that* Abundance of Pains, Art, and Induſtry had been uſed to make the Clergy of *Ireland* apprehenſive of dangerous Deſigns, *conſidered.* p. 22.

Dr. Synge's known Rule of Conſtruction, *and his* Maxim of Law, *conſidered.* p. 24.

Dr. Synge's *Argument to prove that* Pretence of Zeal, *ſignifies a* Real Zeal. p. 27.

Dr. Synge's *Cavil againſt the Word* Only, *as uſed by the* Replyer, *conſidered.* p. 28.

And the word Hypocritical. p. 30.

Notions and Diſpoſitions being different from Practices, not ſufficient to juſtifie the Letter Writer. Ibid.

Dr. Synge's *Reaſoning in favour of the Letter Writer, ſhewn to be equally ſtrong in favour of* Tyndal *and* Toland. p. 32.

Dr. Synge's *Digreſſion about the Arch-Biſhop of* Dublin, *conſidered.* p. 36.

His Grace ſhewn to have countenanced the Letter Writer. p. 37.

The Earl of Wharton's *Reaſons, that induced the Arch-Biſhop of* Dublin, *to be for dropping the Examination of the Letter, conſidered.* p. 41.

The Arguments, uſed by the Arch-Biſhop of Dublin, *to induce the Members to drop the Examination of the Letter, conſider'd.* p. 42.

Dr.

Dr. Synge's *own Arguments, to the ſame purpoſe, conſidered.* p. 45.
Dr. Synge's *Complaint, that we paſſed a Cenſure on the very Intention of the Letter-Writer, conſidered* p. 46.
No Abſurdity to ſay, that the Duke of Ormonde was reſtored to the Government over us. p. 47.
Dr. Synge's *way of applying Scripture.* p. 48.
The application of Joab *and* Amaſa *to the Replyer, and Dr.* Synge, *conſider'd.* p. 49.
Dr. South *introduced to prove, that the Word* Giving up, *is a powerful Engine to drive the Rabble.* p. 51.
Some Paſſages out of Dr. South, *for the uſe of Dr.* Synge. p. 52.

Page 49. line 19. for *Vindication* read *Reply.*

A LETTER TO Dr. SYNGE.

Reverend Sir,

THE Letter which you ſent me in Print I have received, and I think my ſelf obliged in good Manners to return an Anſwer to it, which I will do in as few Words as I can; that, how Troubleſome ſoever I may be to you, I may give as little Trouble as poſſible to my other Readers.

In the Fright and Hurry that you writ, you ſeem to have forgot all Order and Method. I would not be Miſtaken, as if I took upon me to blame you upon that account: No, Great Authors may do what they pleaſe, the Fame and Credit, which their other Learned Writings have eſtabliſhed, will bear them out: But other Perſons muſt not preſume to take ſuch Liberties, and therefore I think it neceſſary to lay down a Method, in Anſwering your Letter, which ſhall be this.

Firſt, To take notice of ſeveral Falſhoods in point of Fact. And,

Secondly, Several Fallacies in point of Reaſoning. And then,

Thirdly, If I have time, I ſhall take notice of a few other things which You mention, tho' not pertinent to the Point in hand.

And First for the Falſhoods in Fact; The very firſt Page of your Letter furniſhes me with Materials in abundance.

You there ſay, that *your Reſolution not to concern your ſelf about any thing that ſhould be Tranſacted in the* Committee, *you were obliged to alter at the requeſt of the Committee it ſelf, in whoſe Name Dr.* T. (I preſume you mean Dr. *Travers*, if I be miſtaken I am under your Correction) *was pleaſed to deſire you, that you would come to them, and give them your Thoughts touching a point which they were almoſt ready to enter upon.* And you ſay, that *in Obedience to their Summons you came.* Now here in direct Contradiction I muſt tell you, that the Committee never made any *Requeſt* to you to come, nor did they *Summon* you, nor did Dr. *Travers* deſire you to come *in the Name* of the Committee. Dr. *Travers* lives at *Dublin*, and is a Man of known and undoubted Probity, and you or any Man that pleaſes may conſult him whether this be ſo or no. I have asked the Doctor about it, and he tells me, that he went to you of himſelf, without any Order from the Committee, or without pretending to you that there was any ſuch Order. He had heard you ſome time before, in Converſation, make out the due Execution of the Provincial Writs in oppoſition to the *Letter-Writer*, and therefore it was that of his own accord he deſired you to be at the Committee. Theſe Falſhoods I here charge on you, altho' you uſher them in with a peculiar air of Aſſurance, that *the matter of Fact was exactly thus*, as you have related, *and you admire how I could be ignorant of any part of it.*

An unwary Reader may wonder that you ſhould thus falſifie in a matter that does not at all affect the Merits of the Controverſy; but it can't be ſuppoſed that you had no end in it. It gives you an air of Greatneſs to have it thought, that you were ſo conſiderable, as that the Committee could not proceed without you. It is ſomething above the Vulgar, to ſay AT THE REQUEST of the Committee, I did ſo and ſo; IN THEIR NAME Dr. *T.* deſires ME to come and give MY Thoughts, *&c.* This ſort of Vanity you ſeem to have learnt from your Brother *Letter-Writer*: He in the ſame manner with your ſelf gives the World to
V. *p.* 30. underſtand, that *the Houſe Honoured* Him *with a large ſhare of Favour*; *that* He *was moſt concern'd in the Debates and Tranſactions of the Houſe*; *and that* He *drew up moſt of their important Affairs*: And yet it has ſince been found, that this uſeful and neceſſary Man was at the ſame time actually imploy'd in

the

the laudable Work of Betraying that very Body which, *He* pretends, did ſo much Confide in *Him*.

And here it may not be improper to conſider what you have ſaid as to the Reſolutions, which at the Requeſt of the Committee you drew up againſt the *Letter-Writer*, tho' indeed any other Place may be as proper as this; For you are pleaſed to entertain the Reader with them from the Beginning to the End of your Methodical Letter. You complain that I impute all the Five Reſolutions, concerning the Provincial Writ, to your drawing up, whereas you drew up but three of them; It ſeems then, I have given you more Credit than is due to you. Had I err'd on the other hand you would no doubt have put the Reader in mind of your great Services, and would have told the World, that I was Robbing you of the Honour of *ſetting that Matter in ſuch a Light, as ſeemed to give full Satisfaction to all that were preſent.* But now let us ſee whether I have imputed more to you than I ought; You know that the Point in Debate between Dr. *Lambert* and Me was, whether the Provincial Writ had been duly Executed; *He* denied, and *I* affirm'd it, and we appeal'd to the Judgment of the Houſe. Upon which, this Affair amongſt others was referr'd to a Committee, where every Member (and therefore your ſelf amongſt the reſt) was permitted to have a Vote, and They came to Five Reſolutions *Nemine Contradicente*, which are as follow. *Pag.* 5.

1. *That the* Arch-Biſhops *iſſuing Mandates to the ſeveral* Biſhops *of their reſpective Provinces, in purſuance of the* Provincial Writs, *is a due and ſufficient Execution of the ſaid* Writs, *as far as the ſaid* Arch-Biſhops *are obliged to Execute the ſame.*

2. *That in purſuance of the ſaid Mandates, the* Biſhops *giving Notice to, and requiring their ſeveral* Deans, *and* Archdeacons, *together with the* Proctors *for their reſpective* Chapters *and* Clergy, *that have been duly Elected by Virtue of the* Præmunientes Clauſes, *to appear at the Place appointed by the ſaid* Arch-Biſhops, *is a due and ſufficient Execution of the ſaid* Writs; *as far as the ſaid* Biſhops *are obliged to Execute the ſame.*

3. *That the* Provincial Writs *for this preſent* Convocation *have been duly Executed.*

4. *That this Paragraph does ſtrike directly at the very Being of this* Convocation, *by aſſerting that the Writs, for Electing and Returning the Members thereof, were not duly Executed; and conſe-*

quently that this Convocation *is not convened by a Legal Authority.*

5. *That the Aſſertion contain'd in this Paragraph, that the* Provincial Writs *were not duly Executed, is a falſe and injurious Reflection upon their Graces and Lordſhips, the Lords* Arch-Biſhops *and* Biſhops *of this Kingdom.*

Now when I ſaid that *Theſe Reſolutions* were drawn up by Dr. *Synge*, it may fairly be preſumed, that ſuch only of *Theſe Reſolutions*, as concerned the Diſpute between Us, were intended. And I doubt not, but, in ſuch a Caſe, you would have had your *Grammatical Conſtructions*, and your *Maxims of Law*, and your *Charitable Suggeſtions* to have juſtified ſuch an Interpretation. But I hate all Sophiſtical Evaſions, and therefore muſt freely own, that at the Time of Writing I did think that they had been all Five drawn up by you: But ſince, upon Examination, I find that you drew up the Three firſt only, I ingenuouſly own my Miſtake as to the other Two, which were only inferences from the Three former.

And indeed it is enough for my Purpoſe, that you own your ſelf to have drawn up the firſt Three, ſince you allow that
Pag. 6. *they only touch upon the Merit of the Cauſe*, for therefore it follows, that all thoſe Reſolutions, which touch upon the Merits of the Cauſe, were drawn up, not by any Adherent of mine, (as the *Letter-Writer* had ſaid upon a like Occaſion) but by his own Adherent Dr. *Synge*. *That the two laſt Reſolutions were only deſign'd to render the Perſon of the* Letter-Writer *Odious*, you ſay, *is evident to all who read them.* A great Compliment indeed to the Members! They can't Vindicate their Rights againſt the Aſſaults of one of their own Body, but it muſt be with the poor Deſign of rendring him Odious. But ſuppoſe this had been the Deſign, ought not ſuch a Perſon to be rendred Odious to all the World, that others may be deter'd from the like Treacherous Attempts for the future? And have we not Inſtances of the like Nature in both Houſes of Parliament, and in all regular Societies in the World?

Another Falſhood, which you impute to me, is my laying to your Charge the Principle, that *every Writing as well as every Man, is preſumed to be good and true till the contrary be made*
Pag. 8. *to appear.* But pray conſider, was it I that laid this Principle to your Charge? Or, was it not your own Dear Friend

(for

(for ſo I muſt ſtill call him) the *Letter-Writer*? Does not he poſitively affirm it in as plain terms as Words can expreſs? And does not he at the ſame time tell what great Feats you did with it, *viz. That the oppoſite ſide had not one Word to return, but ſat down baffled and confounded?* App. p. x.

You may remember that this Argument was look't upon, by your own Party, to be unanſwerable, and you got no ſmall Reputation by it: Nor did I ever hear that you refuſed the Honours done to you upon this occaſion. As long as the Principle and your Deductions from it were in any Credit, it does not appear that you ever diſowned it; but now, ſince it has been taken to pieces and ſhewn to be nothing but mere Sophiſtry, it is no longer yours; you diſclaim it, and it is a Mercy that you do not lay it at your Adverſaries Door. Had there been any Miſtake in this point, you ought to have charged it upon the proper Perſon: Or if Party and Friendſhip ſo far prevail'd with you as to forgive him, you ought certainly to have over-look't it, and not to have imputed his Errors to me, who could not imagine that he would charge you with any thing that was unworthy of your Character, or was not ſtrictly true.

But now (tho' if there had been any Miſtake, it was intirely imputable to the *Letter-Writer*, and to no Body elſe, yet) what if after all it ſhould appear that there is no Miſtake, but that you did really and truly lay down this Principle which you now deny. You ſay indeed, that *it was not advanced by you, but urged by another Perſon.* Suppoſe it was, might it not be urged by you alſo? If Another was the Happy Perſon that firſt found out ſuch a *Baffling* and *Confounding* Secret, might not you improve it and, with an Eloquence peculiar to your ſelf, enlarge upon it? If Another had the good luck in half a Minute to lay down the Aſſertion, might not you take the Scent and ſpin it out to half an Hour? And that you did accordingly inſiſt upon this Argument, I have not only the Teſtimony of the *Letter-Writer* (who in this one point muſt be allow'd to be a Credible Witneſs, as being your Friend and Aſſociate) but alſo the Teſtimony of ſeveral other Members, as Dean *Moſſom*, Dean *Clayton*, Dr. *Leigh*, Archdeacon *Maurice*, Mr. *Moline*, Mr. *Schuldham*, and others too long to name; all whom I have conſulted, and they can eaſily charge their Memory with it. And indeed the Argument was ſo remarkable, that ſure no one that ever heard it, could forget the Perſon that urged it. Pag. 8.

As

As for your *Declaring publickly in the Houſe, that you could not blame Mr.* Percivale *for making the Repreſentation*; You ſeem to be puzzled, whether you had beſt own or deny it.

Pag. 10. *Something like it*, you own, *you ſaid, but it was touching one part of the Repreſentation only, and not of the whole.* This is a poor Evaſion; to the beſt of my remembrance it was of the Repreſentation in General, and not of any particular part of it, that you ſpoke. And indeed, if the making of a Repreſentation was not blameable, I can't imagine how you can blame any part of it, ſince there was no part but what was, upon a full and ſolemn Examination in the Lower Houſe, found to be a juſt and true account of the Facts therein related. You own indeed, that you ſaid that *had you been at*

Ibid. London *in the ſame Circumſtances, you believe that you ſhould have done the ſame thing*; but you now ſay, that you explained your ſelf *by the ſame Circumſtances* to mean the *ſame Impreſſions* that were made upon Me. This is another of your poor Evaſions; you may explain your meaning now, but that you did it then, neither I, nor as many as I have conſulted can remember. And pray let me ask you, how came you to know what *Impreſſions* were made upon Me? I am ſure I never told you any more of that Matter, than what I told publickly in Print, as you may ſee, *Pag.* 2, 3. of the *Remarks*; in which you have a plain honeſt Account of the *Circumſtances* I was under, but no account at all of any *Impreſſions* made upon me. And therefore for you to explain the *Circumſtances* I was under, to mean the *Impreſſions* that were made upon me, when you were given to underſtand clearly what the Former were, but had no manner of Notice of the Latter, is, in the way of ſome Modern Reaſoners, to Illuſtrate a thing known by a thing unknown.

Pag. 10. And whereas you *ſolemnly Proteſt, that you never either Publickly or Privately Declared any thing like* what I ſay you Declared, viz. *That the Remarks were, in your Opinion, a full and ſolid Confutation of the Letter, except that in one Point* (viz. *that concerning the Provincial Writ*) *more might have been ſaid than the Remarker had ſaid upon it*; I do as ſolemnly Proteſt, that you did ſay it in the Houſe, and that I among others took Notice of It. I do not affirm as to the Words, but to the Purport and Effect of them I am very poſitive. Your Heat and Paſſion,

Pag. 9. or (if you had rather have it ſo called) *your Loud and Earneſt*

way

way of ſpeaking, might poſſibly ſo Tranſport you as to make you forget ſome few Trifles (and this I own to be one) that can't but be ſuppoſed to ſlip ſometimes in a multitude of Words from the beſt Orator. But becauſe in this Caſe, where I affirm and you deny, the Reader can have no certainty, but muſt determine his Belief according to the Opinion he has of the Sincerity of either of us, I deſire he may enquire of the Reverend Dean *Clayton*, Dr. *Travers*, and Mr. *Maddiſon*, who all aſſure me that they well remember it.

The Reaſon indeed why you could not poſſibly give a Character of the Remarks is very notable, for you ſay that *to this day* (the date of your Letter to me) *you never read them.* And yet you ſay, that *being deſired by the Committee to ſpeak to the Point of the Provincial Writs, you did read* what the Remarker had Written upon that Subject. A great Condeſcention! And the Remarker acknowledges it; and yet, if you never read that Part before, I can prove that you never read it at all. For Dr. *Travers* tells me, that from the Time that he ſpoke to you to come to the Committee, he never parted from you till you came to the Committee, and in that time you read nothing at all. Pag. 11.

A like Argument you bring to prove, that you could not declare that you *Abhor'd* and *Deteſted* the Letter; for you ſay, that *to the very laſt Seſſion of the Houſe, before this Debate, you always publickly declared, and that moſt truly, that you never read the Letter, and knew no more of the Contents of it, than what you had been told by ſome of your Brethren.* But now ſuppoſing you never had read either of theſe Papers, yet, if I can prove that you gave ſuch Characters of them, the Conſequence will be, that you did blindly and upon Truſt from others form ſuch an Opinion of them, and not that you did not Act as I have charged you. As to your having ſaid, as I have repreſented, concerning the Remarks, I have already proved from Undeniable Teſtimony: And that you did expreſs ſuch an Opinion of the Letter, as I have Repreſented, I will prove firſt from your own Teſtimony, and then from the Teſtimony of others. Pag. 12.

That You declared an Abhorrence and Deteſtation of part of the *Letter* (and the Whole no Body could Abhor and Deteſt) I prove thus from Your own Teſtimony. You ſay, *Pag.* 12. *That You read the* Letter, *and found ſeveral Errors in it*, and

yet

yet notwithstanding, for certain Reasons, *You endeavour'd to get the whole Dispute dropt.* You own moreover, *Pag.* 13. (tho' You say it was long after this Debate) *You declared that You did* Detest *and* Abhor *all False Assertions that had any evil Consequence attending them, That you look'd upon the* Letter-Writer's *Opinion, touching the Execution of the* Provincial Writs, *as a great Error in Point of Law, and if it should Obtain of Pernicious Consequence: And therefore, that You did really* Detest *and* Abhor *it.* These are Your own Words, and they bear Witness against You. And as to the Testimony of Others, I Appeal to the Reverend the Dean of *Kilkenny*, the Dean of *Kildare*, Dr. *Travers*, Dr. *Leigh*, Mr. *Northcote*, Mr. *Moline*, Mr. *Maddison*, and Mr. *Schuldham*, whether You did not Publickly declare a Detestation of the *Letter* in general, and that You would join in the Censure of it. They all Assure me You did, and have, in Justice to Truth, given me leave to Name them upon this Occasion.

Pag. 12. But You say, *You never read the* Letter *'till the Evening before the Debate*, i. e. *not 'till* June 26. and yet You know that on *May* 23. You Moved very earnestly, to have the Examination of it put off for Three Weeks. But if You never read it, How could You be so desirous of having it put off? It might contain (for any thing You knew) Treason, Heresy, and Blasphemy, or any thing else that might be inconsistent with such a Delay.

Ibid. You own, that *Evil Things were Objected to it*, and that
Ibid. *a great* Stir *was made about it in* Convocation, and that
Pag. 6. *the Torrent run strong and high against it.* And could You in all this Storm sleep Supinely, and not have Curiosity enough to read the *Letter* that had occasioned this *Stir*, and this *Torrent?*

When it was referr'd to a *Committee*, You say, *You had fully*
Pag. 5. *Resolved not to concern your self about any thing that should be Transacted in it*; Altho' such was the Importance of the Affair, that every Member was permitted to have a Vote; and Consequently You were concerned as much as any, to see Right done to the *Convocation*: And can You justifie Your Resolution to withdraw Your self at such a Juncture? The Enemy is at the Gate, and must You only be Exempted from the Common Service?

You may Remember, that when a Pamphlet came out, in which *your* Name was mention'd, and in which you thought *your* Reputation concern'd, the Alarm was immediately ta-

ken

ken, the Gooſe-quill called for, and much Ink and Paper ſpoiled in *your* Vindication: But the Convocation it ſeems may be Treated with Scorn and Contempt, the Members of it Traduced, and its very Being called in Queſtion, and yet in this Caſe you can ſtand by unconcerned, and unreſenting. Is this Conſiſtent with the Truſt repoſed in you, as a Member of that Venerable Body? And can any of thoſe Prudential Conſiderations, at that Time ſo much in Vogue, juſtify you, in withholding your Aſſiſtance at a Time when it was moſt wanted? Could you behold your Aged Mother Gagg'd, and Bound, and ready for Deſtruction, and not Move in her Defence and Reſcue? We read in Story, that the Dumb Boy ſpoke when he ſaw the Knife at his Fathers Throat; there the Tongue that never ſpoke before, was provoked to Cry out: But here we have the Reverſe of the Story, and the Tongue that ſeldom lay ſtill in Triffling Matters, is now upon the moſt Momentous Occaſion tempted to be Silent. You excuſe your ſelf indeed by ſaying, that *it could not be of any Advantage to us, to give the World occaſion to think that we had any apprehenſion that our Rights and Privileges could be Shaken by ſuch an* Anonymous *Pamphlet. And for this Reaſon* alone *it was, that you endeavour'd to get the whole Diſpute dropt.* But was not the Pamphlet, in which you thought *your* Reputation ſhaken, *Anonymous*? Why therefore could that ſo worthily deſerve your Notice, and the other not; unleſs it be, that you have a great Regard for your ſelf, but none at all for the Convocation? *Some Juſtice* you have endeavour'd to do to His Grace the Arch-Biſhop of *Dublin*, and to the Lord Biſhop of *Cork*; altho' the Pamphlet, in which, you would perſwade them, they were injured, was *Anonymous*: Why then did not the Convocation in the ſame Circumſtances, meet with *ſome Juſtice* from the ſame Quarter? Will not theſe Proceedings of yours ſeem Selfiſh and Partial? And will not the Malicious World be Tempted to think, that the Reaſon why you have been ſo forward in Vindicating theſe Prelates, who, you own, never deſired your Aſſiſtance: and ſo backward in Vindicating the Convocation, who called for it and had a Right to it, is becauſe theſe Prelates have Preferment in their Diſpoſal, and the Convocation has none.

Pag. 12.

Pref.

Pag. 17. But to proceed. You blame me for saying, that *you denied, as roundly as Dr.* Lambert, *that the House had Power to censure any thing in Print.* And you here declare, that *you never once denied, and much less roundly denied this Power to be in the House.* That *you said no more but that it was matter of Law, in which we ought to take good care at this juncture not to be Mistaken.* Very well; this I take to be denying the Power, for the time at least, till we could be inform'd by Counsel, whether the Convocation had this Power or no. You say, *you*
Pag. 18. *do not know by what Name to call this* round Dealing *of mine, in charging a thing thus* directly *upon you.* And yet all that you own of Dr. *Lambert*'s denying this Power was, that *He informed*
Pag. 17. *the House, that it was the Opinion of Learned Counsel, who had been consulted in* England, *that the Convocation had no Power, without a Special Licence from the Crown, to proceed in the Judicial Censure of any Book.* According to this Account neither you nor Dr. *Lambert* denied the Power *directly*; you only said, that it was the Opinion of Counsel; so that it still appears that you *denied it as roundly as He.* You had none of these Qualms nor *indirect* ways of Speaking formerly, when, as it appeared upon the Journal, you your self brought in a Printed Pamphlet to be Censured by the House. But *where is the*
Ibid. *great Absurdity,* say you, *if after a year or two, I had been otherwise informed in a Matter of Law, than formerly I was.* A year or two, indeed, is a great while to be of the same Opinion; it might have been Profitable, as well as Fashionable, to have been of an Opinion a year or two ago, which may be otherwise now; and therefore why should not a Man change his Opinion for his Conveniency, as he does his Cloaths, after a year or two's wearing?

But it was upon better Information, no doubt, that you changed your Opinion, for you say that Dr. *Lambert Informed the House,* &c. This is very pleasant, a Malefactor informs his Judges, that they have no Power to proceed against him; and this must have such weight with them, as to induce them to change their Opinions, and condemn their former Proceedings in like Cases. Had Dr. *Lambert* informed the House of any Statute by which this Power had been abridged, or any Eminent Lawyer who was of Opinion that it had been so abridg'd, or any instance in which such a Determination had been acquiesced in, there might have been some

Pretence

Pretence for your acting with ſo much Caution. But, ſince nothing of this is pretended to have been offered, have we not Reaſon to think, that you changed your Opinion in favour of your Friend the *Letter-Writer*, rather than for fear of offending againſt the Law?

Another Fact in Diſpute is this. You ſay in your humble Petition againſt the Proteſters, that *the Petitioners, or ſome of them, did give Conſent that the Proteſt ſhould be entred upon the Journals of the Houſe, at the ſame time declaring that they did altogether diſapprove of the Matter of it.* To which I have anſwered, that *it is well known to be quite otherwiſe, that Dr.* Lambert *moved to have it received into the Journals; and it was agreed to be received before any One of the Petitioners declared againſt the Matter of it.* The Difference between us is this: You ſay that ſome of the Petitioners declared their Diſapprobation of the *Matter* of the Proteſt *at the ſame time* that they conſented to enter it on the Journal; I on the other hand ſay, that none of them did ſo declare till *after* they had ſo conſented. Indeed, that ſome of them were againſt admitting our Proteſt before it was read, and conſequently before they could know the *Matter* of it, I freely own; but that any thing of that nature interven'd between the Reading it, and the Admitting it upon the Journal at Dr. *Lambert*'s Motion, I deny; and I appeal for the Truth of this to every One of the Proteſtors, who were preſent and moſt concern'd to remember every Circumſtance of that Affair. As many as I could meet with I have conſulted, *viz.* the Dean of *Armagh*, the Dean of *Kildare*, Dr. *Wye*, Dr. *Travers*, Dr. *Moline*, (I need not name more in a Point of this Nature) and they all tell me that nothing at all intervened between the reading of the Proteſt, and its being placed by Order of the Houſe upon the Journal; ſo that a great Branch of the complaining part of the Petition proves to be altogether groundleſs; for upon this it is, that you found the Neceſſity of your irregular Petition, *viz.* becauſe the Houſe would not do you Juſtice in hearing your Reaſon againſt our Proteſt, which you ſay you offered *at the ſame time* it was admitted into the Journal, but which I here prove you did not offer 'till *afterwards*.

Pag. 24.

Pag. 103.

Indeed, that you moved that the Proteſt ſhould be taken into conſideration *juſt after* it had been voted upon the Journal, I have freely own'd; as alſo, that you were ſhown the Abſurdity of ſuch a Motion, for that you might as well have brought back into Debate any thing elſe that ſtands upon the Journal, as well as this; that the proper time of Debating it was when the Proteſt had been read in the Houſe, for that the Houſe was then in Poſſeſſion of it. I own alſo, that then you deſired to have your *Reaſons* againſt it entred upon the Journal, but that the Houſe refuſed to admit them, as being a Requeſt not only unpreſidented, but abſurd; for if your *Reaſons* had been admitted upon the Journal, might not We deſire the ſame Favour to enter *Reaſons* againſt your *Reaſons*, and then You other *Reaſons* againſt ours, and ſo on in *Infinitum*.

This is an Abſurdity that bears hard upon you. *Not at all*,
Pag. 28. ſay you, *for in all Judicatories whatſoever where Reaſon and Equity are the Rule each contending Party is and ought to be allowed to Alledge, Anſwer, Reply, or Rejoin, until ſuch time as the Matter in Controverſy comes to be ſet in its full and clear Light, and for ſo long, ſure Reaſon againſt Reaſon can't with Juſtice be rejected.* No doubt, each Party ought to be allowed to Alledge, Anſwer, Reply, or Rejoin, but after the Cauſe is Determined, muſt Reaſons againſt the Judgment of the Court be entred upon the Books, and then Reaſons for it, and then Anſwers to theſe Reaſons, and then Replies, and ſo on? Yes, you think this very proper, for, ſay you, if
Ibid. in ſuch a Caſe *either Party ſhould go on unreaſonably to Protract the Controverſy, then indeed, and not till then, the Judges muſt interpoſe their Authority, and put an end to their Pleadings.* Very well, but what if either Party, when the Judges have interpoſed their Authority, ſhould refuſe to put an end to their Pleadings, and complain publickly in Print concerning the ill Treatment they have met with from thoſe Judges? Is not this exactly your Caſe? The Lower-Houſe are here the Judges, they muſt interpoſe their Authority and put an end to the Pleadings, when either Party go on unreaſonably to Protract the Controverſy; and have not they interpoſed, by refuſing to admit your Reaſons upon their Journals? And if they had been ſo Indulgent as to admit of Reaſons, Anſwers, Replies, and

Re-

Rejoinders upon their Books; ſtill when ever they thought fit to put a ſtop to them, would not the Party ſo hindred complain, with the ſame reaſon that you now do, that he had not Juſtice done him.

As for what you mention in Vindication of Dr. *Brown*, the preſent Lord Biſhop of *Cork* and *Roſs*, I chooſe rather to refer my Reader to what I have already written upon that Subject in the 5th Section of my Reply to the *Letter-Writer*'s Vindication, than to enter into a freſh Detail of that Matter. And I am not apprehenſive that his Lordſhip will think me in the leaſt injurious to him in ſo doing. And as for the Facts in Diſpute between us, I refer my Reader to the Meſſage laid before their Lordſhips, *July* 29. 1709. Publiſhed by the *Letter-Writer* in the *Appendix to his Vindication*, and by me in my *Reply*, where the Reader will find a full and faithful Narrative of the whole Affair relating to his Lordſhip, not made by me or any Adherent of mine, but by the whole Lower-Houſe.

I believe the Reader is by this time ſatisfied on which ſide the Truth lies, and which of us is to be moſt credited. Several other Falſhoods I obſerve in your Letter; One particularly ought not to be paſſed by, *viz.* your inſinuating that we *were ſo intent in Cenſuring this Letter, as to neglect the Converſion of the Papiſts, or the Reconciling of Diſſenters.* Here you exactly follow the Patern which your Great Maſter the *Letter-Writer* had ſet you: and rather than not aſperſe the Houſe, you invent ſomething Diſgraceful to lay to their Charge. But this Imputation is as Falſe as it is Malicious, for I have ſhewn that we ſpent but a very few Seſſions upon the Letter: and it appears by our Books, that the Meſſage from the Biſhops about Converting the Papiſts and Reconciling Diſſenters was immediately taken into conſideration, a Committee appointed upon it, and a Method or Propoſal for thoſe purpoſes drawn up and laid before their Lordſhips. I could produce, I ſay, ſeveral other Inſtances of Falſhood, but that I am loath to trouble the Reader any longer upon a ſubject which is purely Perſonal.

Pag. 53.

Pag. 108.

And now upon a Review, the Reader muſt judge between us. I have affirm'd and you have denied: Thus far we are upon the level, and the Reader can determine nothing, but

that

that One of us is very grosly mistaken. I have therefore been necessitated to produce the Testimony of several Members to Vouch for me, and this I presume will with all reasonable Men put the Matter out of Dispute. Indeed my single Testimony, considering the Circumstances we were both of us then under, must be allow'd to have more weight then yours. What End could I have in acting at that juncture as I did? Could I hope to advance my self by Vindicating the Convocation, when the Person that attack'd it was so vigorously supported by the greatest Power? You know what We were threatned with; and are Bonds and Imprisonments so desireable, as that a Man should choose to part with Truth it self, rather than not obtain them? Had Riches and Honours and Preferment been in view, as a Reward of our Actings, the Weakness and Corruption of Human Nature might cause Suspicion; but can any Man be suspected of Lying, when he not only knows that he can get nothing by it, but is sure by so doing to expose himself to the rage of a Powerful and Implacable Party?

Besides, it is well known (and I hope I may without breach of Modesty be permitted to say it) that my Credit has been Tryed, it has been brought to the Test, and it has appeared the brighter for having been called in Question. For you may remember that the Representation which Mr. *Higgins* and I made in *England*, at the Request of the Lower-House of Convocation there, was publickly Impeached in the Convocation here by the very *Letter-Writer* whom you Defend. And what was the consequence? Why, every Part of it, after a nice and solemn Examination, was Voted to be Just and True: Whereas the Letter writ in opposition to it, has by the same Lower-House been found, in almost every part of it, to be False and Scandalous. So that it is no New thing with me, to meet with Contradictions of this Nature. This Controversy with you is a Branch of the Original One with the *Letter-Writer*: The Cause, that has proved Infamous in his Hands, is now taken up by you, and I am not surprized to find it managed after the same manner; For Dear Friends are generally of the same Complexion. Indeed all Friendships are founded upon a Congruity of Manners and Dispositions; *Idem velle & idem nolle.* Give me but a Character of

Pylades,

Pylades, and I will give a ſhrewd Gueſs at that of *Oreſtes*; and therefore I do not wonder to ſee you mention the awful Name of *God* and *Conſcience* with the ſame Familiarity, and to the ſame purpoſes as the *Letter-Writer*.

And having now done with your Falſhoods in Facts, I will haſten to your Fallacies in Reaſoning. And indeed the Tranſition is eaſy; for Falſhood and Sophiſtry generally go together, and both equally miſlead the Underſtanding. An Honeſt Man will no more impoſe upon his Neighbours Weakneſs by falſe Reaſoning, than he will upon his Credulity by falſe Narrations. Reaſoning keeps up the *Intellectual* Commerce, as Money does the *Civil*; and it is as baſe to Counterfeit in the One as it is in the Other.

SECTION II.

In which I am to take Notice of ſeveral Fallacies in Point of Reaſoning.

THE Part of the Letter, which you were Vindicating at the time that we were Interrupted by a Prorogation, and which you have ſince undertaken to Vindicate in the Paper before me, is this.

I muſt obſerve, ſays the *Letter-Writer*, *that, ſome time before the meeting of the preſent Convocation in* Ireland, *Abundance of Pains, and Art, and Induſtry were uſed, to make many of the Clergy of that Kingdom apprehenſive of dangerous Deſigns then forming againſt the Rights of the Church here; And particularly, that ſome of the Biſhops of this Church were encroaching on the Rights and Privileges of the Lower Clergy; And deſigned either to enſlave them or make them a uſeleſs part of the Convocation. It is not neceſſary to tell you under what influence, nor by what concurrent Accidents this Notion began to obtain. It is enough to ſay, that many did too readily entertain it, and conſequently that the Lower Clergy of* Ireland *were under a ſtrong Diſpoſition to Copy after the Majority of the Lower-Houſe here; and to Aſſume thoſe for undoubted Rights and Privileges, which they ſaw ſo warmly claimed and defended by their Brethren here, and all under Pretence of Zeal for the Eſtabliſh'd Church.* The

The Reſolution which the Committee had then paſs'd upon this Paragraph, and which the Houſe has ſince paſſed, *Nemine contradicente*, was this,

Reſolved, *That this Paragraph contains Matters that are* Falſe *and* Scandalous, *highly reflecting on the Clergy of* Ireland, *and injurious to the Rights of the* Lower-Houſe *of* Convocation.

The *Letter-Writer* (in the *Appendix* to his *Vindication*, p. x.) tells how, upon the Debate, you *Baffled* and *Confounded* thoſe who were for making this a Reſolution of the Houſe. His words are *Dr.* Synge *Anſwered, that they* (i. e. the Committee) *had charged the Paragraph with Falſity, that it lay upon them to make Good the Charge; for that every* Writing *as well as every* Man *is preſumed to be Good and True, till the contrary be made to appear*; and then he goes on to your other Arguments.

But that the Reader may have the Controverſy upon this Point in a due Light before him, I will beg leave to repeat the whole of what I have ſaid as to this Affair in my *Reply*. It will be neceſſary for thoſe who have not yet read it, and they, who, have may paſs it by: My words are theſe; "In
Pag. 82. "Anſwer to this (*viz. that every* Writing *as well as every* "Man, *is preſumed to be* Good *and* True, *till the Contrary be* "*made to appear*) I reply, That indeed every *Man* is preſu- "med to be *Good* and *True*, 'till the Contrary be made to "appear: And for that very reaſon every *Writing* is not. "For ſuppoſe a *Writing* ſhould be publiſhed Repreſenting "ſome *Men* to be otherwiſe than *Good* and *True*, without ſo "much as pretending to prove them ſo; What muſt we do "in this Caſe? According to Dr. *Synge*'s Argument, both "the *Men* thus Repreſented, and the *Writing* ſo Re- "preſenting them muſt be preſumed to be *Good* and *True*, "'till the Contrary be made to appear; And is not this a "manifeſt Contradiction? But now, ſince it is allow'd on "both ſides, that *every* Man *is preſumed to be* Good *and* True "*till the Contrary be made to appear*; it undeniably follows, "that every *Writing* that Repreſents a Man to be otherwiſe, "without making it to appear, is preſumed to be *Falſe* and "*Scandalous*. And is not this exactly the Caſe before us? "Has not this Paragraph Repreſented the Clergy of this "Kingdom to be very Wicked, or at leaſt very Weak? And

"has

" has it in the leaſt attempted to prove the Charge? Muſt Pag. 83.
" we not therefore Preſume the Clergy to be *Good* and *True*,
" ſince the Contrary has not been made to appear? And
" conſequently the Paragraph to be *Falſe* and *Scandalous*?

" The *Letter-Writer* ſays, that *Dr.* Synge *went on and proved* Appendix,
" *the Truth of every thing contain'd and aſſerted in that Para-* Pag. x.
" *graph.* I believe this is much more than Dr. *Synge* will ven-
" ture to affirm; for he was ſo far from proving the Truth
" of every Aſſertion contain'd in that Paragraph, that he at-
" tempted to prove no more than this: *That ſome Pains had*
" *been uſed to make ſome of the Clergy apprehenſive that ſome of*
" *the Biſhops of* England *were encroaching on the Rights of the*
" *Clergy.* And the way he took to prove this was, by ſay-
" ing that he lived at *Cork*, where there were no Bookſellers,
" and therefore he was forced to Correſpond with a Book-
" ſeller in *London*, from whom he had ſome Ramphlets, in
" which he met with ſeveral inſinuations againſt the Biſhops:
" And that He and one Dr. *Neal* uſed to lend ſuch Books to
" one another. This, to the beſt of my Remembrance, and
" to the beſt of the Remembrance of ſeveral of the Members,
" whom I have conſulted upon this occaſion, was the whole
" of his Argument; which certainly, if it proves any thing,
" proves only that he himſelf had uſed *the Pains, Art, and*
" *Induſtry* here ſpoken of. Let the Reader therefore judge
" with what Truth the *Vindicator* ſays, that the Doctor pro-
" ved every thing contained in the Paragraph *with ſo much*
" *Clearneſs, ſuch Evidence of Facts, ſuch convincing Arguments,*
" *and all of them ſo well known to the numerous Auditory, who*
" *were then preſent; that the Gentlemen of the Oppoſite ſide had*
" *not one word to return to him, but ſat down Baffled and Con-*
" *founded; only Mr.* Percivale *attempted*, &c.

" The great Concern which Dr. *Synge* ſhow'd in favour of
" the *Letter-Writer*, together with the great Heat and Paſſion,
" with which he expreſſed himſelf, was ſurprizing to all who
" had reaſon to expect a very different Behaviour from him.
" For he declar'd publickly in the Houſe, that *He could not*
" *blame Mr.* Percivale *for having made the Repreſentation, and*
" *that, had He been at* London *in the ſame Circumſtances, He*
" *believed that He ſhould have done the ſame Thing.* He decla-
" red moreover, *that the* Remarks *were in his Opinion a full and*

" *ſolid Confutation of the* Letter; *except that in one point,* (viz.
" *that concerning the Provincial Writ*) *more might have been*
Pag. 84. " *ſaid than the* Remarker *had ſaid upon it.* He had alſo
" declared publickly how much he Abhor'd and Deteſted
" the *Letter*, and that he would, after the Adjournment to
" *June* 16th, as readily join in the Cenſure of it, as any Man,
" and he was as publickly put in mind of his having made
" ſuch a Declaration.

" But to go on; Upon Dr. *Synge*'s undertaking to juſtifie
" the Truth of every Propoſition contain'd in the Paragraph,
" Mr. *Percivale* deſired to know whether he would juſtifie
" that part of it, which charged the Lower Clergy of *Ireland*
" with acting *under Pretence of Zeal for the Eſtabliſh'd Church.*
" To this it was anſwered, that *That* did not relate to the
" Clergy of *Ireland*, but of *England*; Upon this Mr. *Percivale*
" took the Book in his Hand, and ſhew'd from the Context
" and from the plain Grammatical Conſtruction of the Words,
" that it could refer to none but the Clergy of *Ireland*: For
" that it was the Clergy of *Ireland* who were Repreſented *to*
" Copy *after the Majority in the Lower-Houſe in* England, *and*
" *to* aſſume *thoſe for undoubted Rights and Privileges, which they*
" *ſaw ſo warmly claim'd and defended by their Brethren in*
" England; immediately it follows, *and All under Pretence of*
" *Zeal for the Eſtabliſh'd Church*: The *All* therefore that is
" ſaid to have been done *under a Pretence of Zeal*, was the *Co-*
" *pying* and the *Aſſuming*. Since therefore it is acknowledg-
" ed, that it was the Clergy of *Ireland* that were ſaid to have
" *Copyed* and to have *Aſſumed*, it muſt be *They* alſo who are
" ſaid to have *acted under a Pretence of Zeal.*

" And to this no other Anſwer was given, than what the
" *Vindicator* relates Dr. *Synge* to have offer'd; That *he would*
" *take any Book* (*the Bible only excepted*) *and would oblige him-*
" *ſelf, in the way that Mr.* Percivale *treated that Paragraph, to*
" *force Hereſy, Blaſphemy and Nonſence, or any other Charge*
" *upon it.*

" There are two or three Affirmations concerning the Cler-
" gy of *Ireland* going before, and there is the Copulative *And*
" to Connect them with what follows, and therefore accord-
" ing to Dr. *Synge*'s Expoſition of the Words, the Senſe of

" them

" them must run thus; *The* Copying *and* Assuming *of the Clergy of* Ireland *was all done by the Clergy of* England, *under Pretence of Zeal.* Thus He must make Nonsence of the Words " to avoid the Sense that they naturally bear; and in which " the Committee took them.

" But now, suppose these Words were capable of referring " to the Clergy of *England*; Is it true then that the Lower " Clergy of *England act under a pretence of Zeal only*? Must *Pag.* 8. " we believe such a Scandalous Assertion of so Venerable a " Body, and this without any the least Proof? For we have " Nothing but the *Letter-Writer*'s bare Word for it. And " will not Dr. *Synge* allow *Them* the benefit of his Noble " Axiom, which he is willing to allow to every paltry Writing, that *They ought to be presume*d Good *and* True, *till the* " *contrary be made to appear*? The Paragraph therefore must " be own'd to be *False* and *Scandalous*, tho' we should allow " the Clergy of *England*, and not the Clergy of *Ireland*, to " be meant by it; Which is the utmost that the Doctor " contended for.

I beg pardon for repeating so much of my Reply, but I conceive the Reader will hereby have a better view of the Controversy between us. And now I come to consider what you offer against it.

You Object, *That I lay to your Charge a Principle which (whether True or False) was not advanced by you*; that every *Writing* as well as every *Man* ought to be presumed to be *Good* and *True*, till the contrary be made to appear. *This*, you *Pag.* 8. say, *I consider as an* Aphorism, *and without due regard to the present occasion, and so endeavour to expose it to scorn.* Now an Aphorism is generally taken to be a *Wise* Saying, but so far was I from considering this Assertion of yours as such, that I always took it to be a very *silly* One, and accordingly I have, as you truly say, *endeavour'd to expose it to Scorn*; and so effectually have I done it, that you have not one word to return in favour of it. And again, so far was I from *considering it without regard to the present occasion*, that it is with regard to the present occasion only, that I have considered it at all. And as for *its not being advanced by you*, I have just now shewn that it is not with Me, but with the *Letter-Writer*, that you

must diſpute that point; tho' I have *ex abundanti* ſhewn from good Teſtimony, that, had I imputed it to you, I had not wrong'd you, for that you did really inſiſt upon it.

And here I cannot but obſerve, that tho' you have nothing to ſay in vindication of this *Principle*, yet you are
Pag. 9. loath wholy to abandon it. *Whether True or Falſe*, you ſay, *it was not advanced by you.* Why all this mincing of the Matter? One would expect from a Man of your Candor and Sincerity, that we ſhould be told directly whether it were True or Falſe, that ſo you might vindicate it if *True*, or give it up if *Falſe*. But you ſeem to be in a Quandary; you dare not ſay it is *True*, and you are loath to ſay it is *Falſe*. As ugly as the Brat is, you have ſtill ſome Bowels for it, and cannot wholy ſhake off the *Father*.

Pag. 8. But *the Argument hinted at was urged by another Perſon.* The Argument hinted at—— there was no hint in the Caſe. The *LetterWriter* ſet down the Argument in its full force, and at the ſame time ſaid directly, and as poſitively as words could expreſs, that it was yours; and I do not find that (how free ſoever you have been with *Me*) you have once taxt *Him* with having done you any Injury upon this occaſion. But ſince the *Letter-Writer* has not done you Juſtice in his Repreſentation of it, let us try whether it be any ſtronger as you repreſent it. *It was thus*; (ſay you) *This Paragraph is brought to*
Pag. 9. *the Bar as a Criminal: but no Criminal can in Juſtice be Condemned; except his Crime be firſt ſpecified and then proved. For every* Man *is preſumed to be* Good *and* True, *untill the contrary be made to appear. And, as the Caſe at preſent ſtands, this Rule is fairly applicable to the* Paragraph *now before us.*

Now then we have the Argument in its full force, after all your elaborate Amendments, and a year and a half's Modelling. And yet you ſay, 'tis none of your own; but a Reverend Archdeacons whom you don't think fit to name. And
Ibid. you are *very ſure that if I pleaſe to try how I can refute this Reaſoning, that the ſame worthy Perſon who advanced it can, and you believe will, give me a very full and ſufficient Anſwer.* Now, Sir, I will try, and can ſcarce think that either you or any other *worthy Perſon* will ever be able to give a ſufficient Anſwer to what I ſhall urge againſt it.

The Argument in ſhort is this; You prove that this *Paragraph* cannot be condemned, becauſe no *Criminal* can be condemned

demned, except his Crime be firſt ſpecified and then proved; and this Propoſition you prove, becauſe every *Man* is preſumed to be *Good* and *True*, till the contrary be made to appear. Now if you can prove this *Paragraph* to be a *Man*, we will freely allow you the benefit of this your *Principle*; but it unfortunately happens, that this *Paragraph* is a *Writing* and not a *Man*: and therefore, unleſs you allow that *every* Writing *as well as every* Man *is preſumed to be* Good *and* True, *till the contrary be made to appear*, you prove nothing. But this laſt *Principle* you know is exploded, and is not attempted to be defended even by you.

And have not you well mended the Matter by bringing ſuch an Argument to prove your Point. Every *Man*, ſay you, is preſumed to be *Good* and *True* till the contrary be made to appear; and therefore this *Paragraph*, which is not a *Man*, is preſumed to be *Good* and *True* till the contrary be made to appear; Is not this moſt admirable *Logick?* But you ſay this *Paragraph* is brought to the Bar as a *Criminal*; and no *Criminal* can in Juſtice be condemn'd, except his Crime be firſt ſpecified and then proved: And do not you your ſelf affirm the Reaſon, why no *Criminal* can thus in Juſtice be condemned, to be, becauſe the *Criminal* is a *Man*? and will the ſame Reaſon hold good in reſpect of this *Paragraph* which is not a *Man*, and is only Metaphorically called a *Criminal*? Your *Principle* I allow to be true, but it is ſo far from proving what you drive at, that it directly proves the Point that we drive at. For becauſe every *Man* is preſumed to be *Good* and *True* till the contrary be made to appear; it therefore follows that this *Paragraph* which affirms ſome *Men* to be otherwiſe than *Good* and *True*, without ſo much as pretending to make it appear, ought to be preſumed to be *Falſe* and *Scandalous*. For otherwiſe we muſt preſume both this *Paragraph* to be *Good* and *True*, and the *Men* thus repreſented by this *Paragraph* to be *Good* and *True*, which muſt be a Contradiction.

This Gentleman therefore as repreſented by you, does not argue ſo well, as the *Letter-Writer* repreſents you to have done. There you argued truly and Syllogiſtically as to the *Form*, but your *Principle* was Falſe; here the *Principle* is True, but the Concluſion does not follow. There your *Principle* was to the Purpoſe but not True; here it is True but not to the Purpoſe. Never certainly was a bad Cauſe ſo ill defended.

Having with great assurance of Success laid down your Friends Argument, you proceed to defend your own; which you complain, that *I very much misrepresent, and that, instead of answering it, I only mangle it, and strive to put it into a ridiculous Dress.* Let us see then how the Argument is in your own Dress. The Point to be proved is, that *some time before the meeting of the present Convocation, Abundance of Pains, and Art, and Industry were used to make many of the Clergy of* Ireland *apprehensive of dangerous Designs, then forming against the Rights of the Church in* England; *and particularly that some of the Bishops of* England *were encroaching on the Rights and Privileges of the Lower-Clergy, and design'd either to enslave them, or to make them a useless Part of the Convocation.* And thus you prove it.

Pag. 9.

To Print and spread Pamphlets, *is certainly to take Pains.*

But Pamphlets, *tending to beget such Apprehensions of the Bishops of* England, *were printed indeed in* England, *but spread in this Kingdom.* Ergo.

Abundance of Pains, and Art, and Industry were used &c.

Ibid. The Minor (you say) *you shew'd not only from the Instances of Dr.* Neal *and* your self, *who had several such* Pamphlets *sent to You out of* England, *without sending or paying any thing for them, but also from the Impressions which you found had been made not only upon* your self, *but also on many of your Brethren of the Clergy, to the disadvantage of the Bishops of* England. *The Matter of Fact* (say you) *is Notorious, nor is it with sober Men to be refuted by a little of what they call* Banter.

Pray what Matter of Fact? That you and your Friend had *Pamphlets* sent to you out of *England* without paying for them? Or, that such Impressions were made not only upon your self, but also on many of the Clergy, to the disadvantage of the Bishops of *England?* I do not see how either of these Facts are *Notorious*; And, so far was I from refuting them, *by a little of what they call Banter*, that I did not attempt to refute them at all, nor did I apprehend that it was at all to the Purpose to refute them.

You and Dr. *Neal* had *Pamphlets* sent to you out of *England*, without sending or paying any thing for them; therefore *Abundance of Pains, and Art, and Industry was used to make many of the Clergy apprehensive* &c. I hope in your next Letter you will let us know, who they were that sent you these *Pamphlets*

phlets without paying for them. I have reaſon to think that they were ſent by your own Friends, and not by any of thoſe upon whom you endeavour to fix the Charge. And indeed ſome *Pamphlets*, written againſt the Pretenſions of the Lower-Houſe in *England*, have been ſeen in your Hands, with a Mark in them of their having been preſented by the Author: and theſe I am aſſured you have lent to others; ſo that I am afraid the *ſpreading* of theſe *Pamphlets*, will at laſt lie at your own Door. And indeed they were generally ſo written; in Stile and Argument, ſo like your own *Pamphlet*; that I eaſily agree with you, they might leave *Impreſſions* not only upon you, but alſo upon many of your Brethren of the Clergy, to the diſadvantage of ſome of the Biſhops of *England*. For it is not impoſſible, but that a *Pamphlet* may be written in ſuch a manner, as to hurt thoſe whom it intends to juſtify; We need not go far for an Inſtance of this nature. But, if the *Printing* and *Spreading* of *Pamphlets* is all the Argument that you have to prove, that *Abundance of Pains, and Art, and Induſtry has been uſed*; and if it be a Crime *to uſe ſuch an Abundance of Pains, and Art, and Induſtry, &c.* I fear it will light where you leaſt deſire it. For as yet your own Friends in *England* are the only Perſons who appear to have *Printed*, and your own ſelf the Perſon that has *Spread* theſe *Pamphlets* to the diſadvantage of the Biſhops of *England*.

Thus are the Impreſſions, which you ſay were made, not only upon your ſelf, but on many of your Brethren of the Clergy, to the diſadvantage of the Biſhops of *England*, eaſily accounted for. But ſuppoſe your Friends in *England* had never *Printed*, nor you ever *Spread* any of theſe *Pamphlets*; May not Impreſſions be made to the diſadvantage of ſome Biſhops without any *Pains or Art or Induſtry*, more than what ſuch Biſhops might uſe themſelves? In Caſe a Biſhop ſhould Write, or Preach, or Act againſt the Church and Conſtitution (as I believe you will own ſuch a Thing is poſſible) whatever Notion you might retain of ſuch a Biſhop, I fancy your Brethren of the Clergy would form Opinions to the diſadvantage of Him; and therefore it does not follow, that, becauſe ſuch Impreſſions were found in the Clergy, therefore *Abundance of Pains, and Art, and Induſtry were uſed* by Others.

And having thus conſider'd, what you have urged to prove the Truth of the Paragraph, I come now to conſider, what you ſay in Anſwer to thoſe who oppoſed it. You

Pag. 10. And first you say, that *I declined the assigning of any one false Proposition in the Paragraph, tho' earnestly prest to it.* But have you forgot that I assign'd particularly, the Clergy's being said to have acted *under a Pretence of Zeal*, to be a *false Proposition?* And even here you take Pains to confute the Argument, which I urged to prove the Proposition to be false, altho' you so positively say, that *I declined the assigning of any One false Proposition.*

I not only assign'd this as a *false Proposition*, but I also fully shew'd that the Words, *all under Pretence of Zeal*, could refer to none but to the Clergy of *Ireland*; but that, whether they refer to the Clergy of *Ireland* or *England*, (as you your self can't deny but they must refer to one or other) it was evidently a *false Proposition.* And why you and Dr. *Lambert* should labour so earnestly to fix them upon the Clergy of *England* rather than *Ireland*, I can't imagine; unless it be, that there is a wide Ocean between you and the Clergy of *England*: and, not being Members of their Body, you cannot so easily be reach'd, and call'd to an Account for insulting Them. But certainly the Crime is the same, and the same Injury is done to the Church; nor is the Nature of the Sin lessen'd, tho' you should both happen to escape Punishment. But that the Words did really refer to the Clergy of *Ireland* only, I shew'd from the Natural Connection, and the Grammatical Construction of the Words.

Pag. 13. To which You reply; that *it may with as fair Probability be urged, that it is a known Rule of* Construction, *that all relative Words in a* Period *are to be Construed in* Conjunction *with the next foregoing* Antecedent, *with which they are capable of being join'd; except there be something either in the Sentence or Connected with it, that will not admit of this Interpretation.* And You say further, that *this is not only good* Grammar, *but* Law *also: It being one of the* Maxims *of it, for the Determination of the meaning of such Phrases, as otherwise might be Ambiguous, that* ad proximum Antecedens fieri debet Relatio, nisi impediatur Sententia.

Now allowing your known Rule of *Construction* to be as good *Grammar*, and your *Maxim* to be as good *Law* as you can desire; I will gratify you so far as to grant, that they may

may with a *fair Probability* be Urged; and not only ſo, but I will let the Merit of the Cauſe be Try'd by them.

I have plainly ſhewn, that the *All* which is here ſaid to be done *under a Pretence of Zeal*, was the *Copying* and *Aſſuming*; and that therefore, ſince it was the Clergy of *Ireland* that were ſaid to have *Copyed* and *Aſſumed*, it muſt be *They* alſo who are ſaid to have acted *under a Pretence of Zeal*.

I own the Words *defended by their Brethren here*, i. e. in *England*, are the neareſt Antecedent Words, to the Words *all under a Pretence of Zeal*; but the Rule is, that *ad proximum Antecedens ſieri debet Relatio* niſi impediatur ſententia, i. e. *The Relative ought to refer to the neareſt Antecedent, if the Senſe will admit of it*; but, that the Senſe will not admit the Word *All* to refer to the Words you mention, I have ſhewn, becauſe it would make Nonſenſe of them: for that according to your Expoſition, the Senſe muſt run thus; *The Copying and Aſſuming of the Clergy of* Ireland, *was* All *done by the Clergy of* England *under a Pretence of Zeal*. And what Senſe this will be, I leave you to conſider.

I fancy you your ſelf was ſenſible of the weakneſs of this Argument, by your flying to another; and that is, *where any Mans words ſeem, in themſelves, to be Ambiguous, he who ſpeaks or writes them, one would think ſhould have the beſt right to Interpret his own Meaning: Nor ought ſuch his Interpretation to be rejected, except there be ſome very manifeſt Reaſon that appears againſt it.* To which I Anſwer. 1. That the Words in Debate do not ſo much as ſeem to be Ambiguous, but are, I think, as plain as any Words or Sentence in his whole Letter. And 2. Had they been Ambiguous, I grant that the Perſon who writes or ſpeaks them, has the beſt *right to Interpret his own Meaning*, if, at the time of his writing or ſpeaking them, he had declared ſuch his Interpretation. Had therefore the *Letter-Writer* told us in his Letter, that by thoſe words he would be underſtood to mean the Clergy of *England*, and not the Clergy of *Ireland*, I ſhould have acquieſced in his Meaning, and ſhould only have taken notice of his improper and abſurd way of expreſſing himſelf. But, when he has no where told us that his Meaning was thus, till he was called to an account for it; muſt he think to bring himſelf off, by ſaying he meant one thing, when the natural Conſtruction of his words imports another? After this rate it would be impoſſible to convince any one, let

Pag. 14.

him write or ſpeak what he pleaſes: For ſhould a Man be accuſed of writing or ſpeaking Treaſon, may he not ſay that he meant ſomething elſe? And, tho' his expreſs words be brought to confront him, have not you put an unanſwerable Argument into his Mouth, that the Words are Ambiguous, and *where any Man's Words ſeem to be Ambiguous, he that Speaks or Writes them has the beſt right to Interpret his own Meaning?* Now to ſuch a Man it would be replyed, that his Interpretation of the Words ought not to be admitted, ſince it would be repugnant to the plain ſenſe of them; and that therefore his diſclaiming the thing now, to ſave himſelf from puniſhment, ought not to be admitted. And 3ly, whereas you
Pag. 14. urge, that *ſuch a Reflection on the Clergy of* Ireland, *could not poſſibly do any manner of Service to the Cauſe* He *had undertaken*: I anſwer, that to caſt Reflections on the Clergy of *Ireland*, ſeems to be one principal part of the Cauſe he had undertaken. For, if his Intent was only to contradict the Repreſentation made in the Convocation of *England* by Mr. *Higgins* and *Me*, why ſhould he go out of his way to tell ſo many groundleſs and ſcandalous things of the Clergy of *Ireland*, where that Repreſentation did not give him the leaſt handle or pretence for ſo doing? Witneſs the falſe and diſgraceful Stories which he tells of Diſputes (which never happened) between the two Houſes, relating to the Virger and the Vice-Prolocutor; and his many Inſinuations againſt the Clergy, as if they were a dangerous Body of Men, and many of them diſaffected to the Government. So that from your own mouth your Cauſe muſt be Condemned; for if it be a good Argument, that *theſe* (pretended) *Ambiguous Words ought not to relate to the Clergy of* Ireland, *becauſe ſuch a Reflection on the Clergy of* Ireland *could not poſſibly do any manner of Service to the Cauſe he had undertaken*: You muſt allow, if it can be proved that *ſuch a Reflection on the Clergy of* Ireland *is in great part the very Cauſe that he has undertaken*, that then theſe words (ſuppoſing them to be Ambiguous) ought to be underſtood of the Clergy of *Ireland*. And that to reflect on the Clergy of *Ireland*, was in great part the very Cauſe he had undertaken, is evident, from the Inſtances I have juſt now mentioned, as well as from many other Paſſages in his Letter.

But if you ſay, that ſuch Reflections on the Clergy of *England* were of more Service to *the Cauſe he had undertaken*, than

than if he had reflected on the Clergy of *Ireland*, there must be some very extraordinary reason for it, which you and the *Letter-Writer* have not yet thought fit to communicate to the World. For why should the *Letter-Writer* be so severe upon the Convocation of *England*, who have not appear'd ever to have provoked him: And so tender of the Convocation of *Ireland*, who (it must be own'd) had provoked him very eminently, by acquitting the Two Members, whom he would have had Censured; and by voting the Paper, which they had given in to the Convocation of *England*, to be a Just and True Representation of the Matters contain'd in it? If you be in the Secret, if there be any reason why the *Letter-Writer* should be so angry with the Clergy of *England*; and why it should do more Service *to the Cause he had undertaken*, to reflect upon *Them* than upon *Us*; Pray let the World into it, it may possibly give some Light into the Conduct of some Persons which has hitherto seem'd to be unaccountable.

But after all this Dust which you have raised, concerning the Interpretation of these Words, you are pleased to give up the Point; and say, that *the Principle, upon which ALONE you would have defended this part of the Paragraph, is, that the word* Pretence *there does not necessarily imply any evil Reflection.* Pag. 14. If this is the Principle upon which *alone* you would have this part defended; why have you given me all this Trouble to shew that your other Principles were impertinent? To what purpose did you so pompously produce your *Rule of Construction*, and your *Maxim of Law*? Was it to shew your Parts only, and the great Talent you have in disputing, and how able you are to maintain a point that is not tenable? Why have not you been so kind as to shorten the Dispute, if not for mine, yet for the Readers sake, since this Principle *alone* is that which you think defensible?

But now let us consider the Principle upon which *alone* you would have defended this part of the Paragraph: The Principle is, *that the word* Pretence *here does not necessarily imply any evil Reflection*; And how do you prove this Principle? Why thus; the word *Pretence* does not *here necessarily* imply any evil Reflection, because the Word *elsewhere* may *possibly* be so used as to imply none. This is in effect your Argument. You say, *the word* Pretence *is a Term commonly enough used to express the Profession of a Thing, but yet without* Ibid.

out implying a Denial of the reality of it; But I muſt tell you, that Words are not to be put to the Rack to have a meaning forced from them, contrary to their natural Import. The word *Pretence*, as it ſometimes ſignifies barely the Profeſſion of a thing, without either denying or implying the reality of the thing pretended: ſo does it moſt commonly ſignifie the Appearance of a thing only, excluſive of the reality of it; And yet the Word has no Ambiguity in it, for its connection with other Words in the Sentence will always ſhew whether a Denial of the thing pretended is imply'd or no. Thus when you ſay, that *ſuch a Man* pretends *to be your Friend and you verily believe is ſo*, the Words, ſubjoin'd to the word *Pretends*, put it out of doubt that the Denial of the thing is not intended: but without ſome ſuch ſort of Explanation, the Word is oppoſed to *Truth* and implies a denial of the thing
Phil. 1. 18. *Pretended*; thus we read, *Whether in* Pretence *or in* Truth *Chriſt is preach'd.* And again, *Ye devour Widdows Houſes, and*
Matt. 23. 14. *for a* Pretence *make long Prayer.* And, I think, when ever a Man is ſaid to do an ill thing under the *Pretence* of a good thing (which is the Caſe in Point) there a Denial of the reality of that good thing is always imply'd. But you ſay, *we ought not*
Pag. 14. *to take any Man's Words in the worſt Senſe (eſpecially if he diſavow it) if, according to the uſual Cuſtom of Speech, they are capable of a better.* Very well; and we therefore take theſe Words in the worſt Senſe, becauſe, as I have proved, they are not, according to the uſual Cuſtom of Speech, capable of a better. And as for your *Parentheſis*, the Author never diſavow'd the Senſe I take them in; He ſaid indeed, that it was not the Clergy of *Ireland* that were meant; but never pretended, either at the time of the Debate, or ſince, in his printed Vindication, that we took thoſe Words in a wrong Senſe: Or, if he had, I have ſhewn how little available that Plea ought to be, after his being called to an Account for them.

Before I have quite done with this Argument, I muſt take notice of one groſs piece of Diſingenuity, which you endeavour to fix on me; and that is in relation to the word *Only*, which you repreſent me to have impoſed upon my Reader, as part of the *Letter-Writer's* Paragraph. Now you may remember, that the Words of the conteſted Paragraph, which came under Conſideration, were thoſe which aſſerted the Clergy of *Ireland* to have *Copied and Aſſumed thoſe for undoubted*

Rights

Rights and Privileges which they ſaw ſo warmly claim'd and defended by their Brethren in England, *and All under Pretence of Zeal for the Eſtabliſh'd Church.* We thought it a falſe and ſcandalous Reflection upon the Clergy of *Ireland*, to ſay of them, that they did *All* this under a *Pretence* of Zeal: and it was not in the leaſt hinted at, either by Dr. *Lambert*, or by you, or any other of the *Letter-Writer*'s Friends, that the word *Pretence* was there uſed in an Innocent and Inoffenſive Senſe; all the Apology that was then made in favour of the *Letter-Writer* was, that the Clergy of *England*, and not the Clergy of *Ireland*, were meant by the words; nor does the *Letter-Writer* himſelf in his Vindication inſiſt upon any other Plea. In anſwer therefore to him I ſhew in my Reply, that theſe words could not but refer to the Clergy of *Ireland*; *But* (I add) *ſuppoſe they were capable of referring to the Clergy of* England, *is it true then that the Clergy of* England *act under a Pretence of Zeal only?* This is my Expoſtulation with thoſe who labour'd to fix the reproach upon the Clergy of *England*, and who in the whole Courſe of the Debate had nothing more to ſay in favour of the *Letter-Writer*, than that the Clergy of *England*, and not the Clergy of *Ireland*, were intended by the words; Could therefore this Queſtion of mine be underſtood to be any thing more than my own Inference from the Premiſſes?

In this very Page, I had occaſion to quote the words of the *Letter-Writer* no leſs than five times, and I have as conſtantly quoted them, as they are, without the word *only* affixt to them; ſo that the Reader could not poſſibly be led into a miſtake, by the Expoſtulation which I afterwards made in my own Perſon.

If, as you ſay, it was neceſſary to have proved that the word *only* was imply'd altho' not expreſſed, I preſume I have, in the foregoing Papers, effectually proved it; and *before*, it was not neceſſary to be proved, becauſe it was by the purport of the Debate granted on all hands. For what need would there have been for Dr. *Lambert* or his Friends to have inſiſted as an excuſe to the Clergy of *Ireland*, that not *They* but the Clergy of *England* were meant, if no ill thing at all had been imply'd in the word? His proper Plea then would have been, that there was no harm in the Expreſſion; that the *Pretence* of Zeal there did not imply a Denial of the reality of it; and that therefore either the Clergy of *Ireland* or

the

the Clergy of *England* might take the Expreſſion to themſelves without any offence. But ſince the Defence made for him *then* was quite otherwiſe; ſince it was not ſo much as ſuggeſted that the word *Pretence* ought to be taken in an Innocent Senſe: but only that the Clergy of *England*, and not the Clergy of *Ireland*, were concern'd in it; it neceſſarily follows, that the Words were *then* on all hands taken in the worſt Senſe, and ſo as to imply a Denial of the reality of the thing pretended.

And I ſuppoſe you will allow ſuch a *Pretence of Zeal* as this to be truly *Hypocritical*; which is another word that I, in my own Perſon, add to the word *Pretence*, but which you ſuggeſt that I repreſent to the Reader as yours or the *Letter-Writer*'s; and that, becauſe this is (as you ſay the word *only* was) put together, with the other words of the Sentences where they

Pag. 21. ſtand, in Italick Characters. For you ſay, that *one would expect (and many will be apt to believe accordingly) that I ſhould ſet down no words, at leaſt in the Italick Character, but either thoſe of the Paragraph it ſelf, which the Letter-Writer writ or you defended; or ſuch as were expreſsly uſed by him and you in your Debates upon it.* Indeed I ought not to ſet down any words as *yours* or *his* either in Italick or any other Characters, that *you* or *he* have not written or ſpoken; but my own words, or my own Comment upon your words, I hope, I may ſet down in what Characters I pleaſe. And if my Comment be not juſt, it is your buſineſs to ſhew it; and not to amuſe your Reader with a complaint of my having miſrepreſented you, when there is no Ground or Reaſon for it.

Pag. 22. Notwithſtanding you own, that your ſelf and the *Letter-Writer* have charged the Lower-Clergy, with *entertaining a Notion*, which you think is of dangerous Conſequence: And with *being under a Strong Diſpoſition*, to do what you Suggeſt is very Evil: Nay, tho' this *Diſpoſition* is ſuppoſed to appear under a *Pretence of Zeal*; yet you ſay, with a great ſhow of Innocence, that you have not *charged them with the Guilt of any Practices at all.* For, to *entertain a Notion*, is one thing, and *to be Guilty of a Practice* quite another. And that there is *a wide Difference between a* Diſpoſition, and a Practice.

Now

Now I grant, that to *entertain a Notion* is one thing, and *to be guilty of a Practice* is another. They differ widely in ſpeculation: The one (to ſpeak in the Language of the Schools) is an *Imminent*, the other a *Tranſient* Action. And yet, when any Man is charged with entertaining ill *Notions*, he muſt at the ſame time be charged with evil *Practices*. For a *Notion*, whilſt it continues purely ſuch, and does not exert it ſelf in act, is not chargeable with any thing at all: But if a Perſon be ſo fond of his *Notions*, as to diſplay communicate and propagate them, then will good or evil *Practices* be imputed to him, according as his *Notions* are good or bad. When therefore a Body of Men are charged with entertaining ill *Notions*, it implies that their *Practices* are evill: For how but by their *Practices* could their Accuſers come to know the Quality of their *Notions? Every good Tree bringeth forth good Fruit; but a corrupt Tree bringeth forth evil Fruit: By their Fruits ye ſhall know them.* Good and evil *Practices* are the Fruits of good and evil *Notions*; and by the *former* only it is, that you can know the *latter*. Mat. 7. 17, 20.

And thus too I grant, that a *Diſpoſition* in the *Metaphyſical Notion* of it differs from *Practice*; a Man may poſſibly have an ill *Diſpoſition* (as well as ill *Notions*) without exerting it in Act: but before he can be charged with it, or blamed for it, or have it imputed to him as a Fault, he muſt by ſome Act or other ſhew that he has it. A *Diſpoſition* therefore, that is capable of being blamed, implies evil *Practices*. So that it is mere *Sophiſtry*, when you accuſe the Lower Clergy of *entertaining Notions*, and *lying under Diſpoſitions* that you ſuggeſt are evil, to ſay, that you do not charge them with the *Guilt of any Practices* at all; ſince neither their *Notions*, nor their *Diſpoſitions* are capable of being charged with any thing, but as they ſhew and exert themſelves in *Practices*.

And indeed, if this *Notion* and this *Diſpoſition* thus charged upon the Clergy, are to be conſidered in their *Metaphyſical* Senſe, abſtracted from *Practices*; what is it that they have done *under a Pretence of Zeal*? Can a Man be ſaid to entertain a *ſimple Notion* without exerting any Practices conſequent to it: or, to lie under a *Diſpoſition* without reducing it into any Act or Habit, *under a Pretence of Zeal?* You ſee how far your over-ſubtil and refined way of Reaſoning carries you; your Friend, I believe, will ſcarce thank you, for (if

I be not much mistaken in him) he would choose rather to lie under the Imputation of reflecting on the Clergy, than of writing Nonsense.

And now, Sir, consider what sort of Cause you are imbarked in, and what sort of Method you have taken to defend it. The Arguments, which you have brought to vindicate this Paragraph of the Letter, may, with equal Reason, be used to justifie any Reproaches whatsoever, that shall at any time be cast upon the Clergy.

For suppose (which you know is not impossible) *Toland* or *Tyndal* should write a Letter, and conclude a Paragraph in it thus, that *the Clergy of the Establish'd Church were Men that lie under a strong Disposition to Copy after the PAPISTS, and were all of them KNAVES and VILLAINS.* Should, I say, such a Paragraph be brought before the Convocation, no doubt we should vote it without much ado to be *False* and *Scandalous*. Nay, we should not so much as give our selves the trouble to prove it such, since it carries the clearest Evidences of *Falshood* and *Scandal* in the Front of it. But you might plead against such a Resolution in behalf of this, with as much reason as you have done in behalf of the *Paragraph* in Debate; and indeed, upon the same Topicks, and with the self-same Arguments, and almost in the same words you might stand up, and say thus.

Mr. *Prolocutor*,

Pag. 9, 10. "REally and truly I can't help seeming to shew a Concern, "to find some Persons endeavouring to bring the House "into a Vote, that a *Paragraph* is *False* and *Scandalous*; and "yet decline the assigning of any one *False Proposition* in it. "Whereas I really think, that every word of the whole *Para-*"*graph* is to a tittle true; I mean if it be fairly and candid-
Pag. 8. "ly Interpreted. I desire them therefore to extract any one "*Proposition* out of it, and to prove the Falsity of it. This is the "first thing proper to be inquired into; nothing in it can "possibly be *True* or *False* but a *Proposition*; and therefore I "desire and move, that such a *Proposition* may be assigned "and fairly debated. This fair and reasonable Motion ought "not to be declined, and I must press very hard, that we
Pag. 17. "may not swallow the *Resolution* whole without any min-

"cing

" cing of it: and do what I can to keep the Houſe from ſuch
" a Vote, as I think can never be juſtified.

" Thoſe, who have charged the *Paragraph* with Falſity, it Pag. 8.
" lies upon to make good the Charge; For *every* Writing,
" *as well as every* Man, *is preſumed to be* Good *and* True, *till*
" *the contrary be made to appear.* But leaſt they ſhould conſider
" this laſt Sentence as an *Aphoriſm*, and without due regard
" to the preſent Occaſion, and ſo ſhould endeavour to expoſe
" it to ſcorn; I muſt here tell you, that this Principle (whe-
" ther true or falſe) ſhall not be advanced by me. But let
" the Argument ſtand in its clear Light, and neither they,
" who find fault with this Paragraph, nor any of their Friends
" will be able to anſwer it. It is thus,

" *This Paragraph is brought to the Bar as a Criminal: But no* Pag. 9.
" *Criminal can in Juſtice be condemned; except his Crime be firſt*
" *ſpecified, and then proved: For every* Man *is preſumed to be*
" Good *and* True, *untill the contrary be made appear. And, as*
" *the Caſe at preſent ſtands, this Rule is fairly applicable to the*
" *Paragraph now before us.* This Argument, I confeſs, is none of
" my own, it is a Reverend Archdeacons; and I am ſure I re-
" peat his Senſe moſt exactly, and for the moſt part in his
" own words. And if they pleaſe to try how they can re-
" fute this Reaſoning; I am very ſure that the ſame wor-
" thy Perſon, who advanced it, can, and I believe will, give
" a very full and ſufficient Anſwer.

" But that the Houſe, by a confuſed Notion of things, may Pag. 19.
" not be brought to vote that *Falſe*, which is ſo very well
" known to be *True*; I undertake to prove the Truth of eve-
" ry Propoſition in the whole *Paragraph*: Which I am very
" ſure I can do; provided that no Senſe be put upon any of
" the Words or Expreſſions of it, but ſuch as they neceſſari-
" ly import. The firſt part of the *Paragraph* (viz. that *the* Pag. 20.
" *Clergy of the Eſtabliſh'd Church lie under a ſtrong Diſpoſition to*
" *Copy after the* PAPISTS) I prove thus; To print and ſpread Pag. 9.
" Pamphlets juſtifying the Doctrine of the PAPISTS, is cer-
" tainly to Copy after the PAPISTS: and that ſuch Pamphlets
" were Printed indeed in *England*, but diſperſed alſo in *Ireland*
" for this very purpoſe, I prove from the Inſtances of Dr.——
" and my ſelf; who in a little Book called, *A Gentleman's Re-*
" *ligion*, (Printed indeed in *England* but ſpread in this King- Gent. Rel.
" dom) have ſhewn that the Popiſh Practice of *Praying for the* Par. 2. S. 44.

" *Dead*, is not Sinful. The matter of Fact is Notorious, nor " is it with ſober Men to be refuted, by a little of what they " call *Banter*.

Pag. 13. " And as for the Pains which they take to prove that the " words KNAVES and VILLAINS, in the laſt line of this " conteſted *Paragraph*, have their reference to the Clergy " of the Eſtabliſh'd Church: it may with as fair probability

Pag. 9. " be urged, that it is a known rule of Conſtruction, that *all " relative Words in a Period, are to be Conſtrued in Conjunction " with the next foregoing Antecedent, with which they are capa-*

Pag. 13. " *ble of being joined; except there be ſomething, either in the " Sentence, or Connected with it, that will not admit of this Inter-" pretation.* Nor is this only good *Grammar*, but *Law* alſo: " It being one of the *Maxims* of it, for the Determination of " the meaning of ſuch Phraſes, as otherwiſe might be Ambi-" guous, that *ad proximum Antecedens fieri debet Relatio, niſi im-" pediatur Sententia.* That theſe words KNAVES and " VILLAINS are to be referred to ſome words that go " before is allowed on all Hands: And that the *neareſt*

Pag. 14. " *Antecedent* word, to which they are referable, is PAPISTS, " any one who can Read, needs no more but his Eyes, to " ſatisfie himſelf. Moreover, where any Man's words ſeem, " in themſelves, to be Ambiguous, he who ſpeaks or writes " them, one would think, ſhould have the beſt right to In-" terpret his own meaning: Nor ought ſuch his Interpre-" tation to be rejected; except there be ſome very manifeſt " Reaſon that appears againſt it. Admitting then that there " were ſome doubt to be made whether theſe words, in Diſ-" pute, were to be referred to the neareſt Antecedent, which " is PAPISTS, or to a more remote one, *viz.* the Eſtabliſh'd " Clergy; what reaſon can be given, why Dr. *Tindal*'s own " Interpretation of his meaning, who [now he is called to " an account for it] utterly diſavows all manner of Deſign, in " that Expreſſion, to caſt the leaſt Reflection on the *Clergy* " of the Eſtabliſh'd Church, ſhould not be accepted? Eſpeci-" ally if we conſider, that ſuch a Reflection as this could not " poſſibly do any manner of Service, to the Cauſe that *Ho-" neſt Gentleman* had undertaken.

" But the Principle, upon which *alone* I am for defending " this part of the Paragraph, is that the words KNAVES " and VILLAINS there, do not *neceſſarily* imply any evil Re-

" flection

" flection: For I appeal to my Grandmothers Bible printed in
" the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, whether the word KNAVE
" is not commonly enough uſed to ſignifie a *Servant*: How
" then can it be a Reflection on the Clergy of the Eſtabliſh'd
" Church, to call them, as St. *Paul* and the Apoſtles are com-
" monly enough called in my Grandmother's Bible. And then
" as for the word VILLAIN, it is commonly enough uſed, in
" our Law-Books, to ſignifie One that holds Lands by a ſer- V. *Coke's*
" vile Tenure; which yet is not inconſiſtent with the Freedom 1ſt Inſtit.
" of his Perſon; and to ſay *That* of the Clergy does not certain-
" ly imply any evil Reflection. Theſe, I ſay, and ſuch like Ex- *Pag.* 14.
" preſſions are very uſual, and altogether conſiſtent with the
" ſignification of the words KNAVES and VILLAINS. Nor
" ought we to take any Man's words in the worſt Senſe (eſpe-
" cially if he diſavow it) if according to the uſual Cuſtom
" of Speech, they are capable of a better.

" All this ado indeed about the Words KNAVES, and
" VILLAINS is in it ſelf perhaps frivolous, but I am com-
" pelled to it, in my own Juſtification.

" They will ſay perhaps, that a Reflection is *implyed* in the *Pag.* 15.
" Words; tho not expreſſed: If ſo, then they ſhould have
" proved the *Implication*, (which they have not ſo much as
" attempted.) But if they think it is *implyed*; is this Impli-
" cation *neceſſary*, and contained in the very ſignification of
" the Words; or only *voluntary*, that is to ſay, in the *In-*
" *tention of the Writer*? The former ſure they will not ſay; *Pag.* 16.
" for a Thouſand Inſtances may be given to the contrary of
" the words KNAVE and VILLAIN, being uſed in our moſt
" ordinary Converſation, without implying ſuch a Reflecti-
" on as without all controverſy is often affixt to the Words.

" But if they ſay that this *implication*, tho' not *neceſſarily*
" contained in the ſignification of the Words, was yet *deſign-*
" *ed* by the Writer: Why don't they prove this *Deſign*?
" Or, at leaſt, give ſome probable ground to ſuſpect it? For
" my part I declare, I am altogether a Stranger to ſuch an
" *Implication*; and think my ſelf obliged to add nothing to
" the Paragraph, but what is (if not expreſſed, yet) *neceſ-*
" *ſarily*, at leaſt, *implyed* in it: And, *taking it after this man-*
" *ner*, I do, in my Conſcience, believe every word of it to
" be exactly true; and am ready when thereunto called to
" give my Reaſons for it.

Pag. 22. " For the Words may be taken in a good Senſe, as well " as a bad one, nor is there any thing in the Paragraph that " ſhould incline a *Charitable* Man (*who thinketh no Evil, be-* " *lieveth all things, and hopeth all things*, 1 Cor. 13.) to deter-
Pag. 18. " mine it to the latter rather than the former. And God " and my Conſcience do bear me Witneſs, that I offer not " one Word in favour of the *Author*, but what I do think to be " ſtrictly agreeable to *Truth*, as well as *Chriſtian Charity*: " To *both which* I wiſh, for their own ſakes, as well as the " Churches, that they, who have accuſed this Paragraph, had " had a careful Eye in all they have ſaid in this Affair.

Pag. 9. Theſe are exactly your own Arguments, and *for the moſt part in your own Words*; and I dare appeal to your ſelf, whether they be not as ſtrong in favour of *Tindal*'s *ſuppoſed* Libel, as of the Letter-Writer's *real* One. Some of them put me in mind of the ingenious *Apothecary* and his *Vehicle*, mentioned by Mr. *Collier*, from whom very probably you took your Hints.

SECT. III.

In which I am to take Notice of a few other Things, which you mention, tho' not pertinent to the Point in Hand.

I Am now come to your *Digreſſions*, the moſt remarkable of which is, that wherein you take upon you to vindicate His Grace the Archbiſhop of *Dublin*; and here you very mo-
Pag. 31. deſtly *beg leave for a moment to* Digreſs, *and deſire me a little to conſider how, and after what manner I have treated a Perſon of my Lord Archbiſhop of* Dublin's *Character and Station in our Church. I repreſent the Letter-Writer* (you ſay) *as a Perſon Guilty of baſe and unworthy Practices, and his Letter as treating the whole Convocation with the utmoſt Indignity and Contempt. I introduce his Grace as declaring that he had as bad an Opinion of the Letter, as the Members of the Committee could have*; and yet *I give the World to underſtand, that the Letter-Writer had been in a very particular manner Patronized by His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, and Countenanced by His Grace the Archbiſhop of* Dublin.

And

And have not I ſhewn the *Letter-Writer* to be Guilty of baſe and unworthy Practices, and that his Grace declared that he had ſuch an Opinion of the Letter? All this is ſo well known, that I do not find that even you your ſelf are hardy enough to deny it. But you ſay, that *I have not offered ſo much as the ſhaddow of an Inſtance wherein this ſame* Countenancing *of the Letter-Writer did conſiſt.*

The place, where I mention His Grace to have *Countenanced* the *Letter-Writer*, is in my *Preface*, where my Subject leading me to conſider how it ſhould happen, that *the Author of a Letter containing ſuch groſs Abſurdities, ſuch notorious Falſhoods, and ſuch ſcandalous Reflections upon the Convocation, ſhould meet with any One Member of that Body ſo much his Friend, as to endeavour to ſcreen him from the Puniſhment due to ſuch baſe and unworthy Practices*; I reſolve it into this, that *had not the* Letter-Writer *been in a particular manner Patronized by His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, and Countenanced by His Grace the Archbiſhop of* Dublin, *I can ſcarce think, that any One ſingle Member would have ſtood up in Vindication of him.*

The Reader will eaſily ſee the Neceſſity I lay under of mentioning His Grace of *Dublin* in this place; for had I laid the the whole Credit of this affair upon the Lord Lieutenant, when part of it ought to be laid ſomewhere elſe, I had not dealt fairly: And now let us ſee whether part of it ought to be laid any were elſe, or no.

But I muſt premiſe, that tho' I did ſay, and do ſtill (having met with nothing in your Letter to convince me to the contrary) *that His Grace Countenanced the* Letter-Writer, yet I no where ſaid or intended to be underſtood, that he Countenanced his Vices; ſo far from that, that I have clear'd his Grace from any the leaſt Suſpicion of it. And this is ſo remarkable in ſeveral paſſages of my *Reply*, that you your ſelf can't help taking notice of it: And accordingly you own, that I introduce His Grace, as *declaring that he had as bad an Opinion of the Letter as they* (i. e. the Members whom he was then perſwading to put off the Examination of it) *could have.* And in another place I ſay, that *the moſt Reverend Prelate who labour'd very earneſtly to prevent an Examination of the Letter, did at the ſame time expreſs to ſeveral of the Members (whom I can name) the greateſt Abhorrence and Deteſtation of it.*

From

From which paſſages it is very plain, that tho' I repreſent the Archbiſhop to have *Countenanced* the Perſon of the *Letter-Writer*, and to have labour'd earneſtly to skreen him from Puniſhment; yet I can't in the leaſt be ſuppoſed to ſuggeſt that he *Countenanced* his baſe and unworthy Practices, as you very unfairly repreſent me to have done. And having premiſed this, I now come to tell you, (tho' you might have ſeen it in my Reply, if you had been willing) what reaſon I had to think, that his Grace of *Dublin* Countenanced the *Letter-Writer*. And,

1. It is well known, that when the Houſe, and their Committee were going on quietly and calmly, with great Unanimity and Temper, in examining the Letter; my Lord Arch-Biſhop ſent for ſeveral of the Members, and uſed many Arguments (other than you mention, and of a different Nature) to induce them to drop the Examination of it. This I preſume you will allow, was giving the *Letter-Writer* ſome little Degree of *Countenance* at leaſt. And you know, that from that very time, may be Dated the Beginning of thoſe warm Debates, that happen'd afterwards amongſt us. But,

2. When this would not do, and the Members of the Houſe were ſtill Reſolved, notwithſtanding his Graces interpoſition, to proceed, and do their Body what Juſtice in them lay, againſt the Attempts of the *Letter-Writer*: and had accordingly ordered the Chairman of the Committee, to make a Report of what Reſolutions the Committee had come to, concerning it. His Grace was pleaſed to ſend for the Chairman, the very day that he was appointed to attend with the Report, and made uſe of his Excellency's Name, to prevail with him, not to go to the Houſe that Day. Now moſt of us thought, that the Chairman was obliged in Duty to attend the Houſe, and therefore to find his Grace influencing him to abſent himſelf, at that juncture, was giving the *Letter-Writer* ſuch *Countenance*, as was very ſurpriſing to Us. But,

3. When even this would not do, but the Houſe was reſolved ſtill to have a Report from their Chairman. His Grace was pleaſed again, ſo far to intereſt himſelf in favour of the *Letter-Writer*, as to be Inſtrumental in having the very Report it ſelf taken out of the Chairman's hands. For as the Chairman own'd in the Houſe, the Reaſon, why he could

not

not make the Report according to the Order of the House, was *because he was dispossessed of it*; *for that he had late at Night received a Letter from His Grace the Lord Arch-Bishop of* Dublin (which he read in the House) to this Effect; *That it was his Exeellency the Lord Lieutenant's Pleasure, that he should wait on his Excellency, before he went to Convocation, and bring with him the Resolutions of the Committee*; and the Chairman farther said, that *he did according to his Grace's Letter, wait upon his Excellency, and left the said Resolutions with him.* And so entirely did he leave them with him, that he never since, even to this day, got them out of his hands again. And this I produce as another Instance of his Grace's having *Countenanced* the *Letter-Writer*. Pag. 93.

From what I have here observed, I doubt not but the Reader will easily discover not *Shaddows* only, but real Instances of his Grace's having *Countenanced*, not the Vices (for those I have shewn that his Grace did *Discountenance*) but the Person of the *Letter-Writer*. If to prevail with Members to drop the Proceedings against him; if to perswade the Chairman of the Committee to absent himself from the House, that the Report might not be made against him; if to be instrumental in getting the Report deliver'd up to my Lord-Lieutenant, so as to baffle it intirely; if all this be not to *Countenance* the Man, whatever he may think of his Vices, I know not what is.

And the *Letter-Writer* himself, who knows best, whether he received *Countenance* from his Grace or no, if he be consulted upon this Occasion, will not I believe deny it. Nay he Glories in it, and, as he has Reason to do, Values himself upon it. Insomuch, that in his last Libel, which I have replied to and you have defended, He tells the World in the Introduction to his *Appendix*, that the reason why it was not made publick sooner was, because *a most Reverend Prelate, to whose Authority and Judgment the Author pays all due Deference, was pleased to interpose and hinder it's coming abroad before. The Author is satisfied, that the Reasons of that Great Man, for what he enjoyn'd, were very Just, and he thinks, that this is a sufficient Apology for it's coming out so late.* Now, that *this most Reverend Prelate* was his Grace of *Dublin*, EVERY ONE (to use your own elegant Expression) *says*, and NO MAN, *that I know of, Contradicts*. And may not the Reader Pref.

der conclude from hence, that this worthy *Pamphlet* had not appeared even when it did, if his Grace had not at laſt withdrawn his Interpoſition, and ſo conſented to it. I own it does not neceſſarily follow, that becauſe his Grace interpoſed and hindred it from coming out ſooner, that therefore he muſt be preſumed to have conſented, when it came out at laſt; yet I ſay, an unwary Reader may be induced to conclude as much, from the *Letter-Writer's* way of expreſſing himſelf. And you, who have taken upon you to be his Grace's Juſtifier, ought to have ſet the World right in this matter, and not have ſuffer'd the *Letter-Writer* to Shelter himſelf under his Grace's Character. For whatever you may think of it, I can tell you, that Others have ſuch an Opinion of the *Letter-Writer*, as to think that his Grace, *Great* as he is, would not add more *Credit* to *Him*, than *He* would *Diſcredit* to his Grace, if in this Affair it ſhould appear, that they mingled Counſels with one another. Such as conſider the tender Friendſhip between you and the *Letter-Writer*, and how much you have *acted* and *ſuffered* in his Cauſe, will be apt to think, that you cannot but know, whether by this inſinuation he has wronged his Grace, or no. If he has not wrong'd him; if it be true, that his Grace was at laſt conſenting to the Publiſhing of this *Pamphlet*; You will not, I ſuppoſe, deny this to be *Countenancing* of him: But, if he has wrong'd his Grace (as I doubt not but he has) will it not ſeem ſtrange, that you who have been ſo ſtrenuous in Vindicating the *Letter-Writer*, in a bad Cauſe, ſhould be ſo ſilent in Vindicating his Grace in a good One. Or, that you ſhould be ſo Officious as to endeavour to do his Grace *ſome Juſtice* againſt Me, who have done him no injury at all; and yet let the *Letter-Writer* eſcape, who you muſt own, has been very injurious to his Grace, in inſinuating as he has done concerning him.

Thus have I given you the Reaſons, that induced me to think, that his Grace *Countenanced* the *Letter-Writer*. Others poſſibly thought the ſame thing, for other Reaſons; For thoſe, who encouraged the violent Proceedings, that were ſet on Foot againſt the Proteſtors, might reaſonably be thought to *Countenance* the *Letter-Writer*: and ſome could not be perſwaded, but that his Grace had ſome hand in that Affair; becauſe his Excellency had a few days before declared, that *he would do nothing in relation to the Church, without*

out consulting the Bishops, and PARTICULARLY his Grace the Arch-Bishop of Dublin. His Grace therefore might possibly be consulted upon that Occasion; But I hope more honourably of his Grace, than to imagine, that any Motives whatsoever could induce him, to join in the Ruin of so many Members, for their having acted in *Convocation* with that Boldness and Integrity, as in Conscience and Duty they were bound to do, in order to preserve the Dignity and Privileges of their Body.

But to proceed; you say, that *nothing can be more plain to Men not blinded by Passion or Prejudice, than that, in this whole Affair, his Grace of* Dublin *acted, as became a wise and tender Father of our Church.* Page 32. Be it so, yet it is most certain that his acting, as he did, gave *Countenance* to the *Letter-Writer*. But I hope you will allow that there were others, and those many *wise and tender Fathers of our Church*, who were of a different Opinion, and who thought that such a Paper ought to have had a due Examination given it, and that the Lower-House ought not to have been interrupted in an Affair that lay so properly before them.

And indeed you could not your self imagine but that, after *We* had given the *Letter* a due Examination, and had detected the Author of it, we should then lay the whole before their Lordships of the Upper-House, and humbly crave their Lordships Advice and Assistance to do the Convocation Justice. Then his Grace of *Dublin* would have had a proper opportunity of laying those Inconveniencies, which you insinuate, before their Lordships; who no doubt would have stopt any farther Proceedings against the *Letter*, if his Grace's Arguments had appear'd to have Weight in them. And certainly all *Men not blinded by Passion or Prejudice* will allow, that my Lords the Bishops, assembled together in Convocation, would be better able to judge whether to proceed in that Affair, might be Detrimental or Advantageous to the Church, than any One Prelate singly by himself could possibly do.

But let us hear the Reasons that, you say, sway'd with his Grace of *Dublin*. *His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant hearing of these Proceedings, lets my Lord Arch-Bishop know that He was not pleased with them.* Ibid. Very probably it was not pleasing to his

Excellency, that we ſhould cenſure his Beloved Chaplain; but is that a Reaſon why we ſhould deſiſt doing the Convocation Juſtice? Well, but you ſay that His Excellency, *amongſt other Reaſons*, gave his Grace this for One; *that He was apprehenſive that the Conſequence of them would be the farther enflaming that unhappy difference, which was between the two Houſes of Convocation in* England, *which every good Man ſhould rather endeavour to compoſe.* Now, Sir, allowing the Earl of *Wharton*, who was then Lord Lieutenant, to be as tender of inflaming, and to have the Peace of the Church as much at Heart as you pleaſe; yet ſtill I can't think either that his Excellency ſhould produce ſuch an inconcluſive Argument, or that his Grace of *Dublin* ſhould be influenc'd by it. For how could the Convocation of *England* be concern'd in the Event of this Affair? Was it to ſerve any Party in the Convocation of *England*, that He writ that *Letter?* Or, will the Reputation of any Party there ſuffer in the Reputation of the *Letter-Writer?* Pray let us know; perhaps ſome Secret may out, which we have not yet been acquainted with. But ſuppoſe ſuch a Conſequence might have followed, I do not ſee why we ſhould tamely lie under ſuch Reproaches, and ſuffer our Privileges to be torn from us, for fear of it. A pretty ſort of Argument therefore it is, where the Principle upon which it is founded is Falſe, and where the Concluſion would not follow, if it were True.

Page 33.

But you ſay, that his Excellency gave his Grace this *amongſt other Reaſons.* I ſuppoſe then you culled out *this* as the ſtrongeſt; in your next *Letter* I hope you will let us know thoſe Others, and Ten to One but they will meet with a due Examination.

Having thus laid down the Argument that his Excellency uſed to prevail upon his Grace of *Dublin*, you proceed to give us the Arguments which his Grace uſed to prevail upon Others.

His Grace, you ſay, *put the Members in mind that they fully and quietly enjoy'd all their Rights and Privileges, without the leaſt oppoſition from any One, who could pretend to call them in Queſtion; that, as long as they did ſo, it was the beſt way to be as quiet as they could.* Here I fear you miſrepreſent his Grace; For how could He tell the Members *This* at a time that his Grace himſelf

Ibid.

himſelf could not but acknowledge, that the very Perſon, in whoſe behalf he was ſolliciting, was One, who gave Oppoſition to their Rights and Privileges, and did pretend, and that publickly and in Print, to call them in Queſtion. Indeed, had no One call'd them in Queſtion, it would no doubt have been the beſt way to be as quiet as we could: Nay, in that Caſe, it would have been the greateſt Folly to have made ſuch a *Stir* (as you call it) about them. The very Fact therefore, upon which you repreſent his Grace's Argument to be founded, being Falſe, all that is built upon it, muſt fall with it. But you go on; *As for the Letter, it was abundantly ſufficient to confute it in Print; which any Man that pleaſed was at liberty to do: But the fewer Diſputes about Rights and Privileges were brought into Convocation, the better it would be; except we were in ſome Danger of loſing them, which at preſent was none of our Caſe.* Pag. 33. It ſeems then the *Letter* was ſuch as deſerved to be confuted; and I dare venture to ſay that it was effectually confuted, and that too in Print; and ſo far forth as it was a matter of Argument, ſuch a Confutation was abundantly ſufficient. But is that all the Puniſhment, you allow to attempts of ſo heinous a Nature? I agree, that the fewer Diſputes the better; and I can ſcarce think that there would have been any at all, had not the *Letter-Writer* and his Friends made them neceſſary. But I can't agree that our Rights and Privileges were not at that time in ſome danger of being loſt. Every the leaſt attack upon them, is putting them into ſome degree of Danger: but to have not only the Rights, but the very Being of the Convocation denied, and that too publickly by one of the Members of it, who is at the ſame time Protected, Countenanced, and Advanced, muſt certainly be attended with a very great degree of Danger. And had ſuch an Inſult been tamely ſubmitted to, it might have encouraged others to have followed his Example, and to have made the like Attacks upon us. But you go on; *Nor could it be for our Advantage to have the World think that our Rights and Privileges could be ſhaken, or in the leaſt endanger'd, by an Anonymous Pamphlet.* Ibid. Now to this I would return an Anſwer, if I could but find out where the ſtreſs of the Argument lay; for I will allow what you pleaſe, either that our Rights and Privileges could be *ſhaken*, or could not be *ſhaken by an Anonymous Pamphlet*: And that it *would be*, or *would not be for our Advantage to*

have the World think that they could be ſhaken; and yet I can't ſee how it follows, that therefore the Member, that thus endeavours to *ſhake them*, ſhould not be called to an Account for ſo doing. Suppoſe any Man ſhould write an Anonymous Libel againſt the Queen and the Parliament, and ſhould call in Queſtion the validity of the Laws made by them; might it not be pleaded, with the ſame Reaſon, that ſuch an Author ought not to be Queſtioned, or Cenſured for ſo doing? For *that it could not be for the Advantage of the Conſtitution, to have the World think that it could be ſhaken, or the leaſt endanger'd by an Anonymous Pamphlet.*

I find in other parts of your *Letter*, as well as here, that great ſtreſs is laid upon the *Letter*'s being *Anonymous*; as if the matter of a Pamphlet were not equally pernicious, whether the Author's Name be to it, or not. And yet *Anonymous* as it was, you and I and all the Houſe, could give a ſhrew'd Gueſs at the Author; and had he eſcaped without Cenſure, and the Times had continued as they were, I doubt not but Others would have been encouraged to appear in the ſame Cauſe, with their Names at full length to their Pamphlets. To ſee the *Letter-Writer* not only go unpuniſhed, but rewarded, would have tempted Others to tread in his Steps; and then, how much Dirt ſoever had been thrown upon us in future Pamphlets, we could not, with any ſhew of Reaſon, examine into them. For it might be urged, that *it would not be for our Advantage, to have the World think* &c. and here would be a Precedent added to all thoſe Arguments, now made uſe of, againſt our taking
Pag. 33. Cognizance of ſuch a Libel. But you proceed; *All ſuch Rights and Privileges, as are founded upon Cuſtom, grow Stronger by a quiet Enjoyment; for which Reaſon, we ſhould (as long as we ſo enjoy'd them) as much as was poſſible, avoid all Diſputes (within our Houſe at leaſt) about them.* And did we not, as long as we ſo enjoy'd them, avoid all Diſputes about them? Not but that I think, ſometimes, Rights and Privileges grow ſtronger by being oppoſed; and I am much miſtaken, if the Oppoſition, that has been given to ours, has not had this happy Effect: They have not only been more known, but have alſo appeared with greater Strength and Luſtre, by the little Cavils that have been raiſed againſt them. No thanks, in the mean time to thoſe worthy Perſons, who have ſo induſtriouſly imploy'd their Learning and Labour, in raiſing and defending theſe Cavils againſt them. *This*,

This, (you ſay) *or to this very Purpoſe, is all that my Lord Arch-Biſhop appears to have ſaid or done in this Affair, except his* Letter *to Dr.* Brown. And yet I have been told of other Arguments, and of a very different Nature from theſe, which his Grace was pleaſed to uſe to ſome Members. But if this was *all*, I think this *all* appears to be very inſufficient for the end, you ſay, it was produced; namely, to perſwade the Members to drop the Examination of the *Letter*. *Ibid.*

And now I come to conſider your own Arguments to the ſame purpoſe, which, tho' you have placed them firſt, I make bold to poſtpone to thoſe, which you have attributed to the Lord-Lieutenant, and to his Grace of *Dublin*. You ſay, that *almoſt all the Records of Convocations in* Ireland *were loſt*: *So that poſſibly there might be ſome difficulty in fixing our Rights and Privileges* (*or ſome of them at leaſt*) *upon a ſure foundation of Law or Cuſtom*; *in caſe that any of them ſhould by our Enemies be called in Queſtion*. And is this a Reaſon why we ſhould neglect the Defence of them, when they *are called in Queſtion*; not only by an *Enemy*, but by the worſt of *Enemies*, an *Enemy* within us? It is well you allow, that not *all*, but only *almoſt all* the Records of Convocations were loſt; *ſome* therefore are remaining, and if out of thoſe few we be able to ſupport our Rights, we may, I hope, venture to face the *Enemy*. But let me ask you, is not this a very odd way of defending the Rights of Convocation, to tell the World, that *almoſt all the Records of Convocations are loſt*, and that therefore we had beſt ſit ſtill, for fear we ſhould only ſhew our Weakneſs? This is your Argument; and is not this to encourage our *Enemies* to attack us, by pointing out to them our weak ſide? Tho' I hope we are not ſo weak, as you and the *Letter-Writer* repreſent us. An *Anonymous Letter*, you ſay, *is printed*; well, and becauſe the *Letter* is *Anonymous*, muſt it not be examined? Yes, you ſay, I have examined it, *and not content with my ſuppoſed Victory, except I might have a Triumph alſo, I endeavour all I can to engage the whole Body of the Convocation in the Quarrel*. Indeed, if this had been mine, and not the Convocation's *Quarrel*, it would have been ridiculous in Me, to have attemped the bringing Them into it; but you may remember, that the Perſon, who brought this Controverſy into the Convocation firſt, was the *Letter-Writer* himſelf. Two Members at the requeſt of the Lower-Houſe *Pag.* 32. *Ibid.*

of.

of Convocation in *England*, had given them a plain honeſt Account of ſome Proceedings in the Lower-Houſe here, which it ſeems was Contradictory to ſome Account, given by ſome Body elſe. This the *Letter-Writer* complained of in Convocation: An Inquiry was made into the whole matter, the Repreſentation of the two Members was examined, and every part of it was voted a *Juſt and True Repreſentation*. All this you have ſtiffled and ſuppreſſed in your Preface, in which you pretend to give your Reader, a true State of the Riſe and Progreſs of this Controverſy. Now the *Letter*, which you vindicate, was publiſhed in oppoſition to the Paper of the two Members, and conſequently in oppoſition to what the Houſe had voted to be *Juſt* and *True*: So that even in this reſpect (to ſay nothing of his Attempts againſt the Rights of the Convocation) it was, in effect, written againſt the Houſe it ſelf; It is plain therefore, that, if this muſt be called a *Quarrel*, it is not mine but the Convocation's.

Ibid. But to proceed; *I endeavour*, you ſay, *to prevail with them, to paſs a Judicial Cenſure, not only upon the Miſtakes of the* Letter, *(which had been enough, if I had had no other Deſign beſides the clearing up of Truth and the Vindication of our Rights) but alſo on the very Intention of the* Writer, *under the Terms of diſingenuous, unfair, ſtriking at the very Being of the Convocation.* I am glad to hear you acknowledge, that there were even *Miſtakes* in the *Letter*; and that there was Truth to be clear'd up, and *Rights to be Vindicated*; but to *paſs a Cenſure on the very Intention of the* Writer, is, it ſeems, very abſurd; But pray, Sir, is that either unuſual or unreaſonable? Do not all human Laws take notice of the *Intention* of the Subject? And is not that the thing, that is chiefly regarded in Puniſhments? Did you never hear, that a Man was convicted of having done ſuch and ſuch a Thing, with *Malice prepenſe*, and with a *Malicious and Seditious Intent*, &c. The inward Deſigns of a Man may be diſcovered by his outward Actions, and a Writing may ſhew evident Tokens, that the *Intention* of the Writer was *diſingenuous*, and *unfair*: and no Writing could have more plain marks of it than this *Letter*, which you juſtifie. If the calling in queſtion known and undeniable Rights: If the aſperſing the Convocation with ſeveral abſurd and ridiculous ſtories, without the leaſt colour of Truth: If the charging us wrongfully with meeting without a competent Authority, be not Tokens that the *Intention* of

the

the *Writer* was *disingenuous*, and *unfair*, and *striking at the very Being of the Convocation*, I know not what is.

And thus I have examined the Argument, which, you say, my Lord-Lieutenant used to convince his Grace of *Dublin*; and the Arguments which his Grace used to convince the Members; and those that you use to convince the rest of the World, that we ought not to have taken the Letter into Consideration. And so much for your first and greatest Digression.

Another of your Digressions is your Criticism upon the word *Restore:* This I think I may fairly reckon among those things which are not pertinent to the Point in hand. For certainly your Cause is not mended, nor are either you or the *Letter-Writer* the better Men, tho' it should appear that I did not understand the true import of this Word. You tell me *Pag.* 52. that *you can't say as your Adversary does*; that Her Majesty has been pleased to *Restore* His Grace the Duke of *Ormonde* to the Government over us. *For*, (say you) to Restore, *in our Language, is an Act of* Justice *and not of* Favour, *and presupposes a* Right *in him to whom the Restitution is made*; In opposition to which I venture to say, that to *Restore*, in our Language, is sometimes an Act of *Favour*, and does not presuppose a *Right* in him to whom the Restitution is made. The English Word imports the same, as the Latine word *Restituo*, which signifies to Re-appoint, or Re-place, without inferring or denying a *Right* in the Person so replaced. Thus when we pray to God to *Restore* a Sick Person to his Health, as the Church directs in the Order for the Visitation of the Sick [*that it may be thy good Pleasure to* Restore *him to his former Health*] according to you, it is a Demand of *Right* from God, which he in *Justice* is obliged to grant. And yet I hope all good Christians will allow, that what *Right* soever we may have to our Health against other Men, yet against God we have none; for to his *Favour* only it is, that we owe our Health, and Lives, and all that we have.

And as the Compilers of the Liturgy have used this word in the same Sense with me, so have also the Translators of the Bible. Thus, *Gen.* 40. 21. The King of *Egypt* is said to have *Restored the* CHIEF BUTLER *to his Butlership again*; and in the next Chapter, *v.* 13. the Chief Butler speaking

ſpeaking of this Favour which his Prince had done him, ſays, *Me he* Reſtored *unto mine Office, and Him he hanged.* But of this enough; the Reader will think that the Game runs low, when we begin to play with Words.

It was but one poor Word that I Animadverted upon in your whole Performance, *viz.* your calling *Unparliamentary a long Word* (by way of Contempt, I ſuppoſe, for you now
Pag. 23. ſay, that *you did not make the Length any Objection againſt it*) and how ſeverely am I chaſtiſed for it? I am gravely told
Mat. 12. 36. in the language of the Holy Scripture, that *a day is coming when we muſt give an account for every idle* Word. And yet you, it ſeems, may uſe what words you pleaſe without fear of being called to an Account for them. Do not you talk *idly*
Pag. 17. when you mention the Houſe, as ready *to ſwallow a Reſolution of its Committee whole, without any mincing of it?* And is it not *idly* ſaid of you, *Pag.* 10. That *every* Word *of the conteſted Paragraph is to a tittle true*, when you had very learnedly told us *Pag.* 8. That *nothing in it could poſſibly be true or*
Pag. 23. *falſe, but a* Propoſition. You tell me of my *ſlanting Oratory*, and *you know not how far a School-Boy may be charmed with it*; But you are certain, *that Men of Senſe and Sobriety will deſpiſe*
Pag. 9. *it.* In another place, you call my Argument *Banter*; and
Pag. 24. you ſay, that *you ſhould not wonder at this Banter from a Comedian*; and indeed in almoſt every Page you deal your Reproaches and foul Language to me very liberally, and yet, becauſe in the ſame Breath you talk of Conſcience, and quote Scripture, you fancy that none of the Words are *Idle.*

But if we muſt give an Account for every *Idle* Word, much more muſt we be accountable for every *Idle* Application of Scripture. The drawing thoſe Sacred Writings into our Perſonal Quarrels, and making them expreſs the Anger and Bitterneſs of our Paſſions, puts me in mind of thoſe wretched Times, when Scripture was quoted to carry on Rebellion Frauds and Cruelties, and that by thoſe who were pleaſed to think themſelves Saints, and who had *Conſcience* always in
Judg. 5. 23. their Mouths to juſtifie the fouleſt Actions. *Curſe ye Meroz*, was then the Word: And how pertinently you have been pleaſed to apply Scripture in this preſent Controverſy, will appear in a few Inſtances.

After I had written my *Vindication* I thought fit to communicate it to the peruſal of ſeveral Friends before I ventured

tured to Publish it. For, by reason that part of it contain'd Mattens of Fact, in which even a careful man might be mistaken, I was not willing to trust my own Memory; And to this I impute it that there are so few Faults in it. For some Pages I reprinted, at the Instance of a Friend, who spy'd some Mistakes; tho' they were triffling, and not very material to the Argument in hand. Had you taken the same caution, I can scarce think that you would have Published your Letter at all; Your Friends would certainly have diſſwaded you from it: And yet this innocent Proceeding of mine is term'd by you a *Smiting of my Neighbour secretly*, and you *Curse* me for it, and that too in the Language of the Holy Scripture. *Curſed is he that ſmiteth his Neighbour ſecretly*, Deut. 27. 24. And, *if I do not truly and ſincerely repent of the Wrong I have thus done you*; you ask, *Will not my Conſcience fly in my Face the next time that I read or ſay* Amen, *to that part of our Publick Office of* Commination? Pag. 44.

Again, it ſeems I had often met you ſince you had rendred your ſelf obnoxious, and before I had publiſh'd my Vindication. The firſt time, you ſay, was at Mr. Juſtice *Coote*'s Houſe, and the laſt at the Lady *Arglaſs*'s Funeral; and *that I was always before hand with you in a kind and friendly Salute*. Particularly, at the Lady *Arglaſs*'s Funeral, that *I ſpake to you with the ſame Air and Expreſſion that one good Friend does to another*; and that *I ſhaked you by the Hand, with how do you, Dr.* Synge? *I am very glad to ſee you.* Now, for ought I know, this may be true; for I remember I never met you, but I ſhew'd you that Civility, which every Chriſtian, and indeed every Gentleman is obliged, in good Manners, to ſhew to another; tho' I cannot recollect the method in which I expreſſed it. And I hope no Provocations will ever prevail ſo far with me, as to make me forget my Duty in this Point. Yet this is repreſented as a heinous Crime, no leſs than Joab's *taking* Amaſa *by the Beard* (for here the Holy Scripture is brought in again to expreſs your Reſentments) *as it were to kiſs him, and ſaluting him with, Art thou in Health my Brother? when he was ready to ſmite him under the fifth Rib*, 2 Sam. 20. 9. And you ask what Difference is there between *Joab*'s Behaviour to *Amaſa*, and mine to you; for, you ſay, that at the ſame time (that I ſhewed you this Civility) *I was preparing, or publiſhing a Book, unjuſtly to take that from you, without which, Life is* Pag. 43.

but of very little value. Now, Sir, I will ſhew you the Difference.

1. *Joab* took away the Life of an innocent Man, who does not appear to have given him any Provocation, or to have laid him under a neceſſity of ſo doing: Whereas what I have written againſt you, is not, I humbly conceive, againſt an innocent Perſon, but againſt One who, at a very critical and perilous Juncture, endeavoured the Ruin of ſeveral of his Brethren: and who made it neceſſary for me, in Defence of my ſelf and the Conſtitution, to write as I have done. There is therefore the ſame Difference between *Joab* and Me, as there is between Him that murthers an innocent Man without any Provocation: And Him that takes up Arms in Defence of himſelf and his Country, in oppoſition to One that had endangered the ſafety of both.

2. The Treachery of *Joab* conſiſts in this; that under the Pretence of Kindneſs he gave that Wound, which he would not have been able to give, if his ſeeming Affection had not left *Amaſa* open and unguarded to him. But is this the Caſe between *You* and *Me*, in this *Polemical* State, that we happen to be engaged in? If, when we accidentally met, I ſaluted you in a Courteous and Friendly manner, did I make any Advantage of it againſt you? Did you lay your ſelf open and unguarded to me, depending upon any civil Words that dropt from me? Or, did I wound you by Virtue of any Confidence repoſed in me? Nothing of this can be pretended; and yet you would have the Reader think that there is no Difference between my Behaviour to you, and *Joab*'s to *Amaſa*.

But pray, Sir, conſider; Cannot one Man have a Controverſy with another in a point of Fact, or Argument, without ſhowing a Hatred and Reſentment againſt his Perſon? and muſt ſuch Perſonal Animoſities break out, and diſturb the Peace of every Family, where they may happen to meet together? For my part, notwithſtanding this Diſpute with you, I retain a due Regard and Charity for your Perſon; nor will I for my own ſake, treat you with ſuch Moroſeneſs and Ill Manners, as you ſeem to be conſcious that you deſerve.

And indeed had I, when we met, uſed you after a different manner from what I did; Had I told you of your Friendſhip with the *Letter-Writer*, and your joining with Him to draw down the Fury of the Civil Power upon your Brethren of the Convocation; I ſuppoſe then you would have ſaid (for you have Scripture ready upon all occaſions) Sir, *whilſt you*

think

think you ſpy a Mote in my Eye, I pray take care there be not a Beam in your own: And when you thus vilifie me for being more a Friend *to a certain Man than you think he deſerves: Beware you have not been more his* Enemy, *than the Goſpel, which we Preach to others, and therefore ſhould our Selves practice, will juſtifie or allow.* For, this is your Language to me in *Pag.* 7. upon no other Provocation, than my mentioning the *Friendſhip* between You and the *Letter-Writer.* Mat. 7. 3.

Again, I am charged with *Uncharitableneſs*, and a Text of Scripture is produced to prove it, becauſe I can't but think that, when the *Letter-Writer* Repreſents the Lower Houſe to have acted *under a Pretence of Zeal*, he meant a Hypocritical ſhew of Zeal only, and not a ſincere and real Zeal. *For*, ſay you, *a Pretence may be* Sincere *and* Real *as well as* Hypocritical: *Nor is there any thing in the Paragraph that ſhould incline a* Charitable *Man* (Who thinketh no Evil, believeth all things, and hopeth all things, 1 *Cor.* 13.) *to determine it to the latter rather than the former.* Whether this be true or not, the Reader by this time is able to judge; and conſequently whether you have treated theſe Sacred Writings with due Reverence, by thus applying them at random, as you have done in this preſent Controverſy. *Pag.* 22.

After the Liberty that you have taken with the Holy Scriptures, I am not Surpriſed to ſee you make free with Dr. *South.* I have, as you obſerve, the Honour to be known to him; And, from the Knowledge that I have of him, I think I may be bold to ſay, that you have made uſe of his Writings to juſtifie Principles and Practices, which that learned and accompliſhed Perſon never intended in the leaſt to Countenance.

Upon our Proteſting againſt the Chair-man's *Giving up* the Reſolutions of a Committee to the Lord Lieutenant; you ſay, *That part of your Proteſt ſounds indeed very full and round, and chimes right to the Humour which ſeems to prevail in ſome Men; But as for the meaning of the Words* [giving up] *in which alone the whole malignity is couched, you have plainly left that to ſhift for it ſelf.* And Dr. *South* is drawn in, to prepare the Reader for ſuch a notable Reflection. Dr. *South* (ſay you) obſerves, *that the Generality of Mankind is wholly and abſolutely Governed by Words and Names: Without; Nay, for the moſt part, even againſt the* *Pag.* 36. Serm. Vol. 2. *Pag.* 398.

knowledge Men have of things——*As for the meaning of the Word it ſelf, that may ſhift for it ſelf: And, as for the ſenſe and reaſon of it, that has little or nothing to do here: Only let it ſound full and round, and Chime right to the Humour, which is at preſent a Gog; and no doubt, with this powerful ſenſeleſs Engine, the Rabble-driver ſhall be able to carry all before him, or to draw all after him, as he pleaſes. For a plauſible Inſignificant Word, in the Mouth of an expert Demagogue is a Dangerous and a dreadful Weapon.* You proceed indeed and ſay, *God forbid, Sir, that I ſhould think of applying this Paſſage, in it's full Force to you; I aſſure you, I am very far from it.*

But if you do not apply this Paſſage *in it's full Force* to me, methinks you ſhould have told how much of it's Force you intend againſt me, and to whom it is that you apply the reſt of it's Force. Some Body or another is here term'd a *Rabble-driver*, and, conſidering the Controverſy to which you apply it, will not the Reader be apt to ſuſpect that the *Clergy* is the *Rabble*, that is here ſaid to be *driven*? But had you given us the whole of what the Doctor has ſaid, we ſhould have eaſily ſeen that thoſe who thus *drive the Rabble*, are ſuch as *with Screw'd Face, and Doleful Whine, ply you with ſenſeleſs Harangues of Conſcience.* And the Words, which in this very place he mentions, are *Popery* and *Superſtition*, *Right of the Subject*, *Liberty of Conſcience*, *Lord Jeſus Chriſt well tuned and humour'd.* And, if he had added *a formal Appeal to Conſcience*, and *a Readineſs in quoting Scripture* upon all Occaſions, it would exactly have ſuited to his Argument. But, I believe, he never dreamt that the Words *Giving up* ſhould be ſuch a powerful *Engine* for driving the *Rabble*.

Serm. on 1 John 3. 21.

Dr. *South* (whom I the rather quote, becauſe you ſeem to have ſome Deference to his Judgment and Authority) takes notice, that there are in the World *ſly ſanctified Sycophants, who with turn'd up Eye, and ſhrug of Shoulder plead Conſcience for or againſt any Thing or Practice.* A man therefore is not always more ſincere, becauſe he talks more of his *Conſcience* than the reſt of his Neighbours. For as the ſame Learned and Diſcerning Author ſays; *For ought I ſee, though the* Moſaical *part of* Judaiſm *be aboliſhed amongſt Chriſtians, the* Phariſaical *part of it never will. A grave, ſtanch, skilfully managed Face, ſet upon a graſping aſpiring Mind, having got many a ſly Formaliſt the Reputation of a Primitive and Severe Piety.*

Ibid.

Ibid.

FINIS.